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# Introduction

Rel-17 NR FeMIMO WI is a RAN1 leading WI with below major enhancement in RAN1 area

* Enhancement on multi-beam operation
* Enhancement on multi-TRP
* Enhancement on SRS
* Enhancement on CSI reporting

In the last meeting, the scope of performance requirement of NR FeMIMO was under discussion and the related agreement was summarized as following table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Items** | | **BS demodulation** | **UE demodulation** | **CSI** |
| Enhancement on multi-beam operation | | NO | NO | NO |
| Enhancements on multi-TRP | Enhancements on Multi-TRP for PDCCH, PUCCH and PUSCH | NO | FFS for M-TRP PDCCH repetition  FFS for M-TRP PDSCH with rate matching | NO |
| Enhancements on Multi-TRP inter-cell operation | NO | FFS for M-TRP Inter-cell PDSCH | NO |
| Enhancements on beam management for multi-TRP | NO | NO | NO |
| Enhancements on HST-SFN deployment | NO | PDSCH for SFN scheme A  FFS for SFN scheme B  FFS for PDCCH and PDSCH CA case | NO |
| Enhancement on SRS | | NO | NO | NO |
| Enhancement on CSI reporting | M-TRP | NO | NO | CSI for M-TRP |
| FDD reciprocity | NO | NO | FFS PMI for enhanced Type II port selection codebook |

Based on the RAN1 feature and work plan of NR FeMIMO, the scope of this email discussion mainly focuses to identify the test scope of performance requirements of NR FeMIMO, identify the potential impact of the UE demodulation requirements and CSI requirements. Meanwhile, the initial simulation assumption also should be discussed to facilitate the test case setup for requirements

In practical, the scope of this email discussion is indicated as follows agenda:

* UE Demodulation and CSI requirements(6.19.4)
* General (10.19.4.1)
* Demodulation requirement (10.19.4.2)
* Enhancement on HST-SFN scenario (10.19.4.2.1)
* Enhancement on Multi-TRP (10.19.4.2.2)
* CSI requirement (10.19.4.3)
* CSI reporting for multi-TRP (10.19.4.3.1)
* Rel-17 eType II port selection codebook (10.19.4.3.2)
* Others (10.19.4.3.3)

List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round

* 1st round: Discussion and identify the potential impact on the UE performance requirements based on the RAN1 feature
* 2nd round: Discussion the test setup and agree the initial simulation assumption for UE demodulation and CSI parts test cases

# Topic #1: Demodulation requirement for Multi-TRP enhancement

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2203778 | Apple | Proposal 1: Given the limited time for performance part for Rel-17 FeMIMO, we don’t introduce requirements for PDCCH enhancements for multi-TRP.  Proposal 2: Do not introduce requirements to verify PDSCH rate matching for 2 linked PDCCH.  Proposal 3: Do not introduce requirements for PDSCH demod for inter-cell mTRP. |
| R4-2204735 | Samsung | Proposal 1: Introduce PDCCH requirements for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes.  Proposal 2: Introduce PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation   * Introduce test applicable rule between existing Multi-DCI intra-cell M-TRP test case and new test case for inter-cell Multi-DCI PDSCH   Proposal 3: Reusing test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2 i.e.   * Time offset/frequency offset: -0.5us /200Hz for FR1 FDD 15kHz SCS; -0.25us/300Hz for FR1 TDD 30kHz SCS * RB allocation: frequency non-overlapping * MCS: 64QAM 1/2 * PCI ID: [0] for TP1, [3] for TP2 * SSB transmission: SSB 1 for TP1, SSB 2 for TP2 |
| R4-2205427 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Introduce PDCCH requirement for Multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes.  Proposal 2: Not to define PDSCH requirement for verifying the rate-matching behaviour.  Proposal 3: Not to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation.  Proposal 4: Select FDM transmission scheme for PDCCH requirement (if introduced).  Proposal 5: Parameter configurations from previous test cases can be considered as baseline with necessary adaptations (if needed). |
| R4-2205775 | Huawei | Observation 1: There is a great gain by performing soft-combining for non-SFN PDCCH enhancement.  Proposal 1: Define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes.  Proposal 2: Define PDSCH performance requirements to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.  Proposal 3: Define performance requirement for enhancements on multi-TRP inter-cell operation with full-overlapping resource allocation.  Proposal 4: For PDCCH performance requirements for mTRP, consider both FDM and TDM. Permutation and combination can be used to reduce the test efforts, such as FDM for AL2 and TDM for AL8.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Parameter** | **Value** | | | **Test 1** | **Test 2** | | Repetition transmission schemes | FDM | TDM | | CBW | 10MHz for FDD15kHz SCS and 40MHz for TDD30kHz SCS | | | CORESET RB | 24 for FDD15kHz SCS and 48 for TDD15kHz SCS | | | CORESET duration | 2 | | | Aggregation level | 2 | 8 | | Propagation Condition | TDLA30-10 | TDLC300-100 | | Antenna configuration | 1x2 and 1x4 | 2x2 and 2x4 | | CCE to REG mapping type | nonInterleaved | | | REG bundle size | 0 | | | Test metric | 1% of Pm-dsg (%) | |   Proposal 5: Reuse test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12.-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2 and configured full-overlapping resource allocation for PDSCH requirement for inter-cell operation |
| R4-2205919 | Intel | Proposal 1: Define applicability rule for UE that supports “IntCell-Mtrp” feature that if such UE satisfied Rel-16 minimum requirements for PDSCH multi-DCI based transmission scheme, inter-cell operation can be also guaranteed (Option 2a Alt1).  Proposal 2: Define demodulation performance requirement for PDCCH FDM repetition scheme only. |

## Open issues summary

Last RAN4 meeting agreeements in the WF R4-2203090/91/92

List of open issues

* Sub-topic 1-1 Test Scope
  + Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes
  + Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.
  + Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation
* Sub-topic 1-2 Test setup for PDCCH requirement for Enhancement on Multi-TRP if introduced
  + Issue 1-2-1: Multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes for PDCCH requirements
  + Issue 1-2-2: Simulation Assumption for PDCCH with FDM repetition scheme
* Sub-topic 1-3 Test setup for PDSCH requirement for inter-cell operation if introduced
  + Issue 1-3-1: Simulation Assumption for PDSCH requirement for inter-cell operation

### Sub-topic 1-1: Test Scope

**Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes**

* Observations
  + Observation 1(Huawei): There is a great gain by performing soft-combining for non-SFN PDCCH enhancement.
* Proposals
  + Option 1(Ericsson, Samsung, Huawei, Intel): Yes
  + Option 2 (Apple): No
* Recommended WF
  + Define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission scheme

**Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Huawei): Yes
  + Option 2 (Apple, Ericsson): No
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung, Huawei): Yes
    - Option 1a(Samsung) : Introduce test applicable rule between existing Multi-DCI intra-cell M-TRP test case and new test case for inter-cell Multi-DCI PDSCH
  + Option 2 (Apple, Ericsson, Intel): No
    - Option 2a(Intel) : Define applicability for UE that supports “IntCell-Mtrp” feature that if such UE satisfied Rel-16 minimum requirements for PDSCH multi-DCI based transmission scheme, inter-cell operation can be also guaranteed
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

### Sub-topic 1-2: Test setup for PDCCH requirement for Enhancement on Multi-TRP if introduced

**Issue 1-2-1: Multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes for PDCCH requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Intel, Ericsson): only with FDM repetition in FR1
  + Option 2(Huawei): Both FDM with intra-slot repetition and TDM with intra-slot repetition in FR1
* Recommended WF
  + Define demodulation performance requirement for PDCCH with FDM intra-slot repetition in FR1
  + FFS on TDM with intra-slot repetition in FR1

**Issue 1-2-2: Simulation Assumption for PDCCH with FDM repetition scheme**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(WF in last meeting):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | | |
| FDD 15 kHz SCS | | TDD 30 kHz SCS |
| CBW | 10 MHz | | 40 MHz |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 (2Tx for each TRP) | | |
| CORESET RB | 24 | 48 | |
| CORESET Duration | 2 | | |
| Aggregation level | 4, 8 | | |
| CCE-REG mapping | Non-interleaved | | |
| REG bundle size | 6 | | |
| Propagation conditions | TDLA30-10 | | |
| Test metric | SNR @1% Probability of missed downlink scheduling grant | | |

* + Option 2(Huawei): Permutation and combination can be used to reduce the test efforts, such as FDM for AL2 and TDM for AL8

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | |
| Test 1 | Test 2 |
| Repetition transmission schemes | FDM | TDM |
| CBW | 10MHz for FDD15kHz SCS and 40MHz for TDD30kHz SCS | |
| CORESET RB | 24 for FDD15kHz SCS and 48 for TDD15kHz SCS | |
| CORESET duration | 2 | |
| Aggregation level | 2 | 8 |
| Propagation Condition | TDLA30-10 | TDLC300-100 |
| Antenna configuration | 1x2 and 1x4 | 2x2 and 2x4 |
| CCE to REG mapping type | nonInterleaved | |
| REG bundle size | 6 | |
| Test metric | 1% of Pm-dsg (%) | |

* + Option 3(Ericsson): Parameter configurations from previous test cases can be considered as baseline with necessary adaptations (if needed).
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any for following proposals
  + Aggregation level
    - Option 1(WF in previous meeting): 4 and 8 for FDM
    - Option 2 (Huawei): 2 for FDM, 8 for TDM
  + Antenna configuration
    - Option 1 (WF in previous meeting): 2x2, 2x4 for FDM
    - Option 2 (Huawei): 1x2 ,1x4 for FDM and 2x2 ,2x4 for TDM
  + Channel model
    - Option 1 (WF in previous meeting): TDLA30-10 for FDM
    - Option 2 (Huawei): TDLA30-10 for FDM and TDLC300-100 for TDM

### Sub-topic 1-3: Test setup for PDSCH requirement for inter-cell opereation if introdcued

**Issue 1-3-1: Simulation Assumption for PDSCH requirment for inter-cell operation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung): Reusing test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2 i.e.
    - Time offset/frequency offset: -0.5us /200Hz for FR1 FDD 15kHz SCS; -0.25us/300Hz for FR1 TDD 30kHz SCS
    - RB allocation: frequency non-overlapping
    - MCS: 64QAM 1/2
    - PCI ID: [0] for TP1, [3] for TP2
    - SSB transmission: SSB 1 for TP1, SSB 2 for TP2
  + Option 2 (Huawei): Reuse test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2
    - RB allocation: frequency overlapping
* Recommended WF
  + Reusing test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2 i.e.
    - Time offset/frequency offset: -0.5us /200Hz for FR1 FDD 15kHz SCS; -0.25us/300Hz for FR1 TDD 30kHz SCS
    - MCS: 64QAM 1/2
    - PCI ID: [0] for TP1, [3] for TP2
    - SSB transmission: SSB 1 for TP1, SSB 2 for TP2
  + RB allocation
    - Option 1(Samsung): frequency non-overlapping
    - Option 2(Huawei): frequency overlapping

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub topic 1-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 1-1-1  Issue 1-1-2  Issue 1-1-3 |
| Intel | **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes**  Support the recommended WF. This feature has impact on UE Rx processing, hence we should define performance test case to verify it. Benefits of this feature should not be discussed in RAN4 since RAN1 has already performed performance analysis and identified benefits. Otherwise, feature would not be defined.  **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.**  We do no think that new UE rate-matching behavior needs to be verified. RAN4 has not defined a dedicated requirement for Rel-16 eMIMO CRS rate-matching pattern. Basicaly, due to limited impact on UE Rx processing. Suggest considering the similar approach. Support Option 2.  **Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation**  We should distinguish discussion on overlapped and non-overlapped multi-DCI Tx schemes. As we understood, Huawei suggested to define new Rel-17 requirement with overlapped alocation. We are fine to define such requirements. Same time, there is no difference between inter-cell or intra-cell scenarios from receive processing perpective, assumed propagation conditions and demodulation performance. Therefore, option 2 is valid regradless of multi-DCI Tx scheme configuration.  Support Option 2a. |
| Apple | **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes**  Option 2. We don’t agree with the recommended WF. We agree there is a gain in PDCCH performance with repetition. Given the limited time for WI completion, we can de-prioritize it.  **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.**  Option 2. We don’t see the need to introduce requirements to validate PDSCH RM at UE.  **Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation**  Option 2. Do not introduce new requirements. We don’t think the current requirements from Rel-16 mTRP can directly be used either. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes**  Option 2. We don’t foresee a huge benefit from introducing requirements for PDCCH in Rel-17. The operating SNR for PDCCH is already quite low. Furthermore, if UE passes the PDSCH requirement, corresponding PDCCH performance can be implicitly ensured.  **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.**  Option 2. Rate-matching around linked PDCCH is mainly a functional behavior. While RAN4 may choose to define test cases to verify UE’s functional behavior, we think it is not warranted here given limited WI time budget.  **Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation**  Option 2. We don’t see a necessity to define requirements for inter-cell m-TRP considering that the UE demod processing is same as that of the Rel-16 m-TRP transmission. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes**  We support the recommended WF. PDCCH enhancement is the main study and achievement, which brings changes on UE reception and benefit on the UE demodulation performance. It should be also verified and guaranteed that the PDCCH repetition and reception from two different TRPs.  **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper ehavior of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.**  We support option 2.  **Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation**  We support option 2. |
| Mediatek | **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes**  We support Option 2 not to define requirement because we don’t see PDCCH performance being the limiting factor.  **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.**  We support Option 2 not to define requirement because this would be functionality test rather than performance test.  **Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation**  We support Option 2 not to define requirement. |
| Huawei | **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes**  Option 1. We think PDCCH enhancement is very important feature and the corrsponding requirements should be defined to verify correct UE processing.  **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.**  Considering the limited time for the WI, we can compromise to Option2.  **Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation**  Option1. We propose to define inter-cell multi-TRP cases with full-overlapping resource allocation to improve UE performance especially when UE is at the edge of two TRPs. |
| Samsung | Issue 1-1-1  Support recommended WF  To Apple, QC and MTK  Compared with Rel-16 eMIMO PDSCH, TDM and FDM repetition can be supported for PDCCH in Rel-17. UE will have different receiver behavior compared PDCCH without repetition transmission. It is necessary to define requirement to verify the proper UE receiver. We agree that PDCCH may be not the limited factor. While from functionality verification perspective, the requirement is needed.  If companies have concern for schedule, we can consider either FDM or TDM for requirement.  Meanwhile, FDM and TDM are different feature with UE capability, if both requirements are considered, the test can be proceeded pending on UE capability  Issue 1-1-3  We prefer option 1.  Firstly, we would like to highlight intra-cell and inter-cell Multi-TRP corresponding different deployment scenario; UE support inter-cell multi-TRP and intra-cell multi-TRP belong different UE capability in Rel-16 and Rel-17  From requirement itself, as mentioned by companies, there is no different UE processing and requirement comparable with Rel-16 M-TRP transmission. Our intention is to introduce test cases with covering different deployment scenario. To reduce the UE test effort, the test applicability rule can be introduced pending on UE capability. Meanwhile, there is no additional simulation work need to do, apply the same requirement for intra-cell and inter-cell. |

Sub topic 1-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 1-2-1  Issue 1-2-2 |
| Apple | Issue 1-2-1  If agreed to introduce requirements, only FDM intra-slot repetition scheme.  Issue 1-2-2  If agreed to introduce requirements, the AL should be chosen based on simulation results and operating SNR > -4dB with 4RX. AL 8 might result in very low SNR. |
| Qualcomm | Issue 1-2-1 Test setup for PDCCH requirement for Enhancement on Multi-TRP if introduced  We don’t support defining requirements for m-TRP PDCCH.  Option 1, if only requirement is introduced |
| Ericsson | Issue 1-2-1  Support FDM only.  Issue 1-2-2  Share similar view with Apple. |
| Mediatek | Issue 1-2-1  If it is agreed to introduce requirement, we would support Option 1 to limit scope only to FDM in FR1.  Issue 1-2-2  If it is agreed to introduce requirement, we would prefer Options 1 (WF in previous meeting). |
| Huawei | **Issue 1-2-1: Multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes for PDCCH requirements**  Option 2. We prefer to consider both FDM and TDM. We think it is both feasible for FDM and TDM in FR1. If companies have concern about the test effort, then the parameters can be combined such as FDM case with AL2 and TDM case with AL8.  **Issue 1-2-2: Simulation Assumption for PDCCH with FDM repetition scheme**  For the aggregation level, we prefer Option2. We propose to consider AL2 for FDM case that is reused from the legacy 1Tx PDCCH cases defined in Table 5.3.2.1.1-1 (Test 1) and AL8 for TDM case that is reused from the legacy 2Tx PDCCH cases defined in Table 5.3.2.1.2-1 (Test 2).  For the antenna configuration, we prefer Option 2. Both 1Tx and 2Tx should be considered.  For the channel model, we prefer Option 2. The propagation condition is reused from the legacy 2Tx PDCCH requirements. |
| Samsung | Issue 1-2-1  Ok with FDM only, to reduce the test effort.  Issue 1-2-2  We are ok with option 1, regarding AL, further checking pending on simulation result based on work point SNR>-4dB with 4Rx, as mentioned by apple |

Sub topic 1-3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 1-3-1 |
| Apple | Issue 1-3-1  If requirements are introduced, we introduce requirements with the same simulation assumptions for mDCI mTRP requirements. |
| Qualcomm | Issue 1-3-1: Simulation Assumption for PDSCH requirment for inter-cell operation  We don’t support defining PDSCH requirements for inter-cell operation. |
| Mediatek | Issue 1-3-1  If it is agreed to introduce requirement, we would support Option 1 of frequency non-overlapping configuration. |
| Huawei | For the RB allocation, we prefer Option2. |
| Samsung | Issue 1-3-1  As mentioned, our intention is to define requirement with cover intra-cell and inter-cell operation scenario. We can apply the existing Rel-16 Multi-DCI, test parameters, without no additional simulation effort  For test, the test applicability can be introduce pending on UE capability to reduce the test efforts. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize Wis and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing Wis, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic #1-1 Test Scope** | **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Ericsson, Samsung, Huawei, Intel): Yes   + Option 2 (Apple, Qualcomm, MTK): No   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Comments are encourage if any * Encourage companies to check whether there is difference receiver processing with PDCCH without repetition   **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Huawei): Yes   + Option 2 (Apple, Ericsson, Intel, Qualcomm, MTK, Huawei (Compromise), Samsung): No   *Tentative agreements:*   * No PDSCH requirement defined with rate matching around two linked PDCCH   **Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Samsung, Huawei): Yes     - Option 1a(Samsung) : Introduce test applicable rule between existing Multi-DCI intra-cell M-TRP test case and new test case for inter-cell Multi-DCI PDSCH   + Option 2 (Apple, Ericsson, Intel, MTK, Qualcomm): No     - Option 2a(Intel) : Define applicability for UE that supports “IntCell-Mtrp” feature that if such UE satisfied Rel-16 minimum requirements for PDSCH multi-DCI based transmission scheme, inter-cell operation can be also guaranteed   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Comments are encourage if any * Encourage companies to check how can guarantee the test coverage with different deployment scenario, considering UE supported inter-cell multi-TRP and intra-cell multi-TRP belong difference UE capability in Rel-16 and Rel-17? |
| **Sub-topic #1-2 Test setup for PDCCH requirement** | **Issue 1-2-1: Multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes for PDCCH requirements if introduced**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Intel, Ericsson, Apple, Qualcomm, MTK, Samsung): only with FDM repetition in FR1   + Option 2(Huawei): Both FDM with intra-slot repetition and TDM with intra-slot repetition in FR1   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Encourage the proponent of option 2 to check whether option 1 can be acceptable based on majority view?   **Issue 1-2-2: Simulation Assumption for PDCCH with FDM repetition scheme if introduced**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(WF in last meeting, MTK):  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Parameter | Value | | | | FDD 15 kHz SCS | | TDD 30 kHz SCS | | CBW | 10 MHz | | 40 MHz | | Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 (2Tx for each TRP) | | | | CORESET RB | 24 | 48 | | | CORESET Duration | 2 | | | | Aggregation level | 4, 8 | | | | CCE-REG mapping | Non-interleaved | | | | REG bundle size | 6 | | | | Propagation conditions | TDLA30-10 | | | | Test metric | SNR @1% Probability of missed downlink scheduling grant | | |  * + Option 2(Huawei): Permutation and combination can be used to reduce the test efforts, such as FDM for AL2 and TDM for AL8  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Parameter | Value | | | Test 1 | Test 2 | | Repetition transmission schemes | FDM | TDM | | CBW | 10MHz for FDD15kHz SCS and 40MHz for TDD30kHz SCS | | | CORESET RB | 24 for FDD15kHz SCS and 48 for TDD15kHz SCS | | | CORESET duration | 2 | | | Aggregation level | 2 | 8 | | Propagation Condition | TDLA30-10 | TDLC300-100 | | Antenna configuration | 1x2 and 1x4 | 2x2 and 2x4 | | CCE to REG mapping type | nonInterleaved | | | REG bundle size | 6 | | | Test metric | 1% of Pm-dsg (%) | |  * + Option 3(Ericsson): Parameter configurations from previous test cases can be considered as baseline with necessary adaptations (if needed).   + Option 4(Apple, Ericsson): AL should be chosen based on simulation results and operation SNR>-4Db with 4Rx   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Encourage comments if any for following proposals  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Parameter | Value | | | | FDD 15 kHz SCS | | TDD 30 kHz SCS | | CBW | 10 MHz | | 40 MHz | | CORESET RB | 24 | 48 | | | CORESET Duration | 2 | | | | CCE-REG mapping | Non-interleaved | | | | REG bundle size | 6 | | | | Propagation conditions | TDLA30-10 | | | | Test metric | SNR @1% Probability of missed downlink scheduling grant | | |  * FDM   + Aggregation level     - Option 1 (WF in previous meeting, MTK): 4 and 8     - Option 2(Huawei): 2   + Antenna configuration     - Option 1(WF in previous meeting, MTK): 2x2, 2x4     - Option 2 (Huawei): 1x2 , 1x4   + Channel Model:     - Option 1(WF in previous meeting, MTK): TDLA30-10 * TDM   + Aggregation level:     - Option 1(Huawei): 8   + Antenna configuration:     - Option 1(Huawei): 2x2, 2x4   + Channel model     - Option 1(Huawei): TDLC300-100 * Companies are encouraged to provide the simulation results with different AL as {2, 4, 8} with 2x2, and 2x4 antenna configuration in the next meeting with FDM, down selection one of AL under condition of operation SNR>-4dB with 4Rx for PDCCH requirement. |
| **Sub-topic#1-3 Test setup for PDSCH requirement** | **Issue 1-3-1: Simulation Assumption for PDSCH requirment for inter-cell operation if introudced**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Samsung, Apple, MTK): Reusing test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2 i.e.     - Time offset/frequency offset: -0.5us /200Hz for FR1 FDD 15kHz SCS; -0.25us/300Hz for FR1 TDD 30kHz SCS     - RB allocation: frequency non-overlapping     - MCS: 64QAM 1/2     - PCI ID: [0] for TP1, [3] for TP2     - SSB transmission: SSB 1 for TP1, SSB 2 for TP2   + Option 2 (Huawei): Reuse test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2     - RB allocation: frequency overlapping   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Reusing test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2 i.e.   + Time offset/frequency offset: -0.5us /200Hz for FR1 FDD 15kHz SCS; -0.25us/300Hz for FR1 TDD 30kHz SCS   + RB allocation: frequency non-overlapping   + MCS: 64QAM 1/2   + PCI ID: [0] for TP1, [3] for TP2   + SSB transmission: SSB 1 for TP1, SSB 2 for TP2 * Reuse the same requirement of Rel-16 Multi-DCI non-overlapped resource allocation for PDSCH requirement with multi-TRP inter-cell operation * Introduce test applicability rule between Rel-16 Multi-DCI with non-overlapped Tx schemes and Rel-17 Multi-TRP inter-cell Tx schemes |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

**Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes**

* ~~Observations~~
  + ~~Observation 1(Huawei): There is a great gain by performing soft-combining for non-SFN PDCCH enhancement.~~
* Proposals
  + Option 1(Ericsson, Samsung, Huawei, Intel): Yes
  + Option 2 (Apple, Qualcomm, MTK): No
* ~~Recommended WF~~
  + ~~Comments are encourage if any~~
  + ~~Encourage companies to check whether there is difference receiver processing with PDCCH without repetition~~
  + ~~From performance gain and receiver processing, encourage companies to check can go option 1 to save progress~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | We prefer Option 1. There is different receiver processing comparing to the normal PDCCH, also there is a great gain observed based on our simulation. We don’t think the performance under multi-TRP repetition transmission scheme can be ensured without defining corresponding performance requirements.  This case is different from the enhanced HST scenario. In HST scenario, we can assume PDCCH performance can be ensured by PDSCH since we have PDSCH test cases and PDCCH is configured with same transmission scheme as PDSCH. However, we don’t have such test case to verify PDCCH processing under multi-TRP repetition transmission scheme.  Could proponent of Option 2 clarify how to ensure the PDCCH performance under multi-TRP repetition transmission scheme if we don’t define such cases? |
| Samsung | We support option 1,  Compared with PDCCH without repetition, we have observed that there is different processing, which need repetition combination. Similar with Rel-16, PDSCH with multi-TRP transmission, it is necessary to define the related requirement to verify the PDCCH performance  From performance gain aspect, as mentioned by Huawei, a clear gain can be obtained. We agreed that PDCCH may be not the limited factor for Downlink, while from receiver aspect, we do see the difference |
| Apple | We support option 2. Given the time for completion of performance part, we can de-prioritize this. We agree that there will be gain with this and it is different UE processing to support this feature. PDCCH is not the limiting factor for DL anyway, so its not critical to define these requirements. UE might not support this feature, but support other mTRP schemes with PDSCH, then network would not use this feature, but other methods like higher AL to improve PDCCH reliability |
| Intel | Similar view a Huawei and Samsung. Support Option 1. |
| Ericsson | We support option 1. PDCCH enhancement for multi-TRP is one of the main enhancements for FeMIMO in Rel-17. The way of soft combining of two PDCCH from different TRPs is quite different in comparison to single TRP PDCCH reception. It is worthy to verify and defining requirement. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. We prefer not to define m-TRP PDCCH requirement.  We agree that repeated PDCCH for m-TRP scheme would provide performance benefit as there are various ways to make use of the repeated PDCCH. However, the operating SNR for PDCCH is already quite low and is known not to be a performance bottleneck. Furthermore, given the limited WI time budget, we think that we should not spend our effort defining PDCCH requirement for m-TRP. |
| Mediatek | We support Option 2. We share similar view to comments from Apple and Qualcomm. |

**Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement to verify whether UE is with proper behaviour of rate matching around the two linked PDCCH.**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Huawei): Yes
  + Option 2 (Apple, Ericsson, Intel, Qualcomm, MTK, Huawei (Compromise), Samsung): No
* Tentative agreements
  + No PDSCH requirement defined with rate matching around two linked PDCCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We are fine with tentative agreement made in 1st round |
| Apple | Fine with tentative agreements from round1. |
| Intel | Support the tentative agreement. |
| Ericsson | Agree with tentative agreements. |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the tentative agreement. |

**Issue 1-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH requirement for Multi-TRP inter-cell operation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung, Huawei): Yes
    - Option 1a(Samsung) : Introduce test applicable rule between existing Multi-DCI intra-cell M-TRP test case and new test case for inter-cell Multi-DCI PDSCH
    - Option 1b (Huawei): Define performance requirement for enhancements on multi-TRP inter-cell operation with full-overlapping resource allocation.
  + Option 2 (Apple, Ericsson, Intel, MTK, Qualcomm): No
    - Option 2a(Intel) : Define applicability for UE that supports “IntCell-Mtrp” feature that if such UE satisfied Rel-16 minimum requirements for PDSCH multi-DCI based transmission scheme, inter-cell operation can be also guaranteed
* Recommended WF
  + ~~Comments are encourage if any~~
  + ~~Encourage companies to check how can guarantee the test coverage with different deployment scenario, considering UE supported inter-cell multi-TRP and intra-cell multi-TRP belong difference UE capability in Rel-16 and Rel-17?~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | We prefer Option 1b to define inter-cell multi-TRP cases with full-overlapping resource allocation to improve UE performance especially when UE is at the edge of two TRPs. |
| Samsung | We support option 1.  We would like to highlight intra-cell and inter-cell multi-TRP are different deployment scenario. UE support intra-cell or inter-cell multi-TRP are belong to UE feature with optional with capability signaling  We agree that from baseband processing, there is no different foreseen. While from test coverage aspect, how can guarantee the test coverage with different deployment scenario, considering UE supported inter-cell multi-TRP and intra-cell multi-TRP belong difference UE capability in Rel-16 and Rel-17, if UE only supported inter-cell multi-TRP  Our intention is to reuse the test parameters in Rel-16 and apply the existing requirement for UE supported inter-cell multi-TRP, and there is no additional simulation effort. Meanwhile, we can introduce the test applicable rule, if UE supported both intra-cell multi-TRP and inter-cell multi-TRP, to reduce the test effort. |
| Apple | We support option 2. We are not entirely sure if same requirements will apply as existing mDCI mTRP requirements in Rel-16. |
| Intel | For non-overlapped allocation we support Option 2a. We can agree on Option 2 and further discuss necessity of applicability rule. For overlapped allocation, we are fine with Option 1b also due to lack this requirement in Rel-16. However, considering limited time in Rel-17 we are also fine to discuss this in next release. |
| Ericsson | We can consider to compromise to option 2a to have applicability rule and no requirement albeit an first preference on option 2. Since we expect the test setup, e.g. channel model, is same, we don’t think it is needed to add the dedicated requirements and to verify the same baseband processing. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. We don’t foresee UE demod processing to be different between Rel-16 multi-DCI and Rel-17 m-TRP inter-cell transmission. Therefore, we prefer not to define any PDSCH requirement m-TRP inter-cell transmission. |
| Mediatek | We support Option 2. |

**Issue 1-2-1: Multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes for PDCCH requirements if introduced**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Intel, Ericsson, Apple, Qualcomm, MTK, Samsung, Huawei (compromise)): only with FDM repetition in FR1
  + Option 2(Huawei): Both FDM with intra-slot repetition and TDM with intra-slot repetition in FR1
* Recommended WF
  + ~~Encourage the proponent of option 2 to check whether option 1 can be acceptable based on majority view?~~
  + Option 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | We can compromise to Option 1. |
| Samsung | Thanks for Huawei compromise |
|  |  |

**Issue 1-2-2: Simulation Assumption for PDCCH with FDM repetition scheme if introduced**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(WF in last meeting, MTK):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | | |
| FDD 15 kHz SCS | | TDD 30 kHz SCS |
| CBW | 10 MHz | | 40 MHz |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 (2Tx for each TRP) | | |
| CORESET RB | 24 | 48 | |
| CORESET Duration | 2 | | |
| Aggregation level | 4, 8 | | |
| CCE-REG mapping | Non-interleaved | | |
| REG bundle size | 6 | | |
| Propagation conditions | TDLA30-10 | | |
| Test metric | SNR @1% Probability of missed downlink scheduling grant | | |

* + Option 2(Huawei): Permutation and combination can be used to reduce the test efforts, such as FDM for AL2 and TDM for AL8

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | |
| Test 1 | Test 2 |
| Repetition transmission schemes | FDM | TDM |
| CBW | 10MHz for FDD15kHz SCS and 40MHz for TDD30kHz SCS | |
| CORESET RB | 24 for FDD15kHz SCS and 48 for TDD15kHz SCS | |
| CORESET duration | 2 | |
| Aggregation level | 2 | 8 |
| Propagation Condition | TDLA30-10 | TDLC300-100 |
| Antenna configuration | 1x2 and 1x4 | 2x2 and 2x4 |
| CCE to REG mapping type | nonInterleaved | |
| REG bundle size | 6 | |
| Test metric | 1% of Pm-dsg (%) | |

* + Option 3(Ericsson): Parameter configurations from previous test cases can be considered as baseline with necessary adaptations (if needed).
  + Option 4(Apple, Ericsson): AL should be chosen based on simulation results and operation SNR>-4Db with 4Rx
* Recommended WF



* + Companies are encouraged to provide the simulation results with different AL as {2, 4} with 2x2, and 2x4 antenna configuration in the next meeting with FDM, down selection one of AL under condition of operation SNR>-4dB with 4Rx for PDCCH requirement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** | |
| **FDD 15 kHz SCS** | **TDD 30 kHz SCS** |
| Repetition transmission schemes | FDM | |
| CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz |
| CORESET RB | 24 | 48 |
| CORESET duration | 2 | |
| Aggregation level | 2/4 | |
| Propagation Condition | TDLA30-10 | |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2, 2x4 | |
| CCE to REG mapping type | nonInterleaved | |
| REG bundle size | 6 | |
| Payload bits(without CRC) | 39 | 41 |
| Test metric | 1% of Pm-dsg (%) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | For the payload size, 39/52 bits for FDD and 41/53 bits for TDD are for Rel-15 PDCCH requirements definition. We prefer to use same payloads for further evaluation. |
| Samsung | Thanks for compromise of Huawei, we can focus on the test parameters of FDM only  Regarding the AL, to reduce the test effort, it seems we can skip AL as 8. Based on current requirement of AL=8, for 4Rx, the SNR is -4.5dB targeting 1% of pm-dsg. And also AL=4, and FDM operation, it is expected the SNR is around -4dB. We can reduce the test effort in the next meeting   * Companies are encouraged to provide the simulation results with different AL as {2, 4, ~~8~~} with 2x2, and 2x4 antenna configuration in the next meeting with FDM, down selection one of AL under condition of operation SNR>-4dB with 4Rx for PDCCH requirement.   Regarding the payload,, we can differentiate it, there is no need to cover the possible payload, since the test purpose is to verify the combination  For FDD with 24 COREST RB , payload is 39 for AL=2/4  For TDD with 48 COREST RB, payload is 41 for AL=2/4 |
| Apple | Propose to limit to AL 2 and include AL 4 if necessary.  Don’t see the need for more than 1 payload size. 1 should be sufficient. |
| Intel | We tend to agree with Apple that one payload is enough to verify this feature considering that UE should also pass normal PDCCH requirements. |
| Qualcomm | We think this legacy way of PDCCH testing does not capture the use case where m-TRP PDCCH can reap performance benefit compared to that of the single TRP transmission. One of the important use cases for m-TRP PDCCH is that it could provide performance benefit (over single TRP scheme) in a scenario when one of the TRPs is blocked. In such a scenario, a different test design is needed, e.g., having one of the TRPs is blocked with certain probability. |
| Mediatek | If it is agreed to introduce requirement, we would prefer to help testing efforts by keeping configurations simple, like Apple is proposing to use only AL 2 and 1 payload size. To our understanding, it should be enough for feature verification. |

**Issue 1-3-1: Simulation Assumption for PDSCH requirment for inter-cell operation if introudced**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung, Apple, MTK): Reusing test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2 i.e.
    - Time offset/frequency offset: -0.5us /200Hz for FR1 FDD 15kHz SCS; -0.25us/300Hz for FR1 TDD 30kHz SCS
    - RB allocation: frequency non-overlapping
    - MCS: 64QAM 1/2
    - PCI ID: [0] for TP1, [3] for TP2
    - SSB transmission: SSB 1 for TP1, SSB 2 for TP2
  + Option 2 (Huawei): Reuse test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2
    - RB allocation: frequency overlapping
* Recommended WF
  + Reusing test parameters of existing Rel-16 multi-DCI based on TRP transmission test case (Table 5.2.2.1.12-2) with different PCI for TP1 and TP2 i.e.
    - Time offset/frequency offset: -0.5us /200Hz for FR1 FDD 15kHz SCS; -0.25us/300Hz for FR1 TDD 30kHz SCS
    - MCS: 64QAM 1/2
    - PCI ID: [0] for TP1, [3] for TP2
    - SSB transmission: SSB 1 for TP1, SSB 2 for TP2
  + Option 1
    - RB allocation: frequency non-overlapping
    - Reuse the same requirement of Rel-16 Multi-DCI non-overlapped resource allocation for PDSCH requirement with multi-TRP inter-cell operation
    - Introduce test applicability rule between Rel-16 Multi-DCI with non-overlapped Tx schemes and Rel-17 Multi-TRP inter-cell Tx schemes
  + Option 2
    - RB allocation: frequency full-overlapping

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | We still prefer to define inter-cell multi-TRP cases with full-overlapping resource allocation to improve UE performance especially when UE is at the edge of two TRPs. |
| Samsung | We support option 1, we are open to check the performance with frequency full-overlapping. While considering there is no requirement of full-overlapping for Rel-16 eMIMO and the baseline receiver is MMSE-IRC, where is IC receiver introduced to handle intra-cell or inter-layer interference. Our intention is to reuse the test parameters in Rel-16 and apply the existing requirement for UE supported inter-cell multi-TRP, and there is no additional simulation effort. Meanwhile, we can introduce the test applicable rule, if UE supported both intra-cell multi-TRP and inter-cell multi-TRP, to reduce the test effort. |
| Apple | If requirements are introduced, new simulation effort is needed in our understanding. We don’t support fully overlapping and prefer to have same assumptions as Rel-16 to be able to define any applicability rule if necessary. |
| Mediatek | If it is agreed to introduce requirement, we still would support Option 1 of frequency non-overlapping configuration. |



# Topic #2: Demodulation requirement for Enhancement on HST-SFN scenario

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2203777 | Apple | Proposal 1: Do not introduce demodulation requirements for SFN scheme B.  Proposal 2: Define test case when both channels (PDSCH/PDCCH) are transmitted using SFN scheme A and define performance requirements for PDSCH only.  Proposal 3: Only define single carrier requirements for HST SFN enhancements in Rel-17.  Proposal 4: Use the following assumptions as baseline for SFN Scheme A   * Reuse the Rel-16 HST SFN test setup as baseline. UE receives from 2 nearest RRHs at any given time. * Rank 2, MCS17 * Max Doppler shift: 870 Hz for 15Khz; 1667 Hz for 30KHz * Channel model: For PDCCH and PDCCH HST-SFN channel model with 2 nearest RRH – time varying path power and path delay. For TRS from each RRH single tap with time varying path power and path delay.   Proposal 5: Evaluate performance improvement of HST SFN scheme A over Rel-16 HST SFN. |
| R4-2204163 | NTT DoCoMo | Proposal 1: Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline (i.e. Option1)   * PDCCH/PDSCH/ SFN transmitted from two RRHs * TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Parameter | Value | | | **FDD 15 kHz SCS** | **TDD 30 kHz SCS** | | CBW | **10 MHz** | **40 MHz** | | Antenna configuration | **2x2; 2x4** | | | DMRS type | **Type 1** | | | Number of DMRS symbols | **1+1+1** | | | TDD pattern |  | **7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U** | | TRS configuration | **10ms, 2 slot pattern** | | | PDSCH mapping | **Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12** | | | Ds and Dmin | **Ds =700m; Dmin=150m** | | | Test metric | **SNR @70% of maximum throughput** | |   Proposal 2: Define the following maximum Doppler shift   * 15 kHz SCS:   + Option 1: 972 Hz * 30 kHz SCS:   + Option 1: 1667 Hz   Observation 1: As for Maximum Doppler shift of Rel-17 HST-SFN scheme B, we would like to clarify how to treat the pre-compensation first. (If RAN4 agrees to introduce the requirement of HST-SFN scheme B) |
| R4-2204268 | CMCC | Proposal 1: for scheme B, we prefer following two options:   * Option 1: introduce PDSCH requirements for SFN for scheme B * Option 2: do not introduce PDSCH requirements for SFN scheme B and define the following test applicability rule to guarantee performance with this scheme:   + If UE passes the existing test cases (demodulation requirement for HST-SFN with high Doppler shift), the performance of SFN scheme B is guaranteed   Proposal 2: it is proposed to define PDCCH requirements for HST SFN scenario.  Proposal 3: for HST-SFN, define single carrier requirement firstly. If time allowed, PDSCH CA requirements for HST SFN scenario can be considered later.  Proposal 4: for 15KHz SCS, the maximum Doppler shift is 870Hz; for 30KHz SCS, the maximum Doppler shift is 1667Hz.  Proposal 5: for Rel-17 HST-SFN test cases, the test parameters are proposed as following:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Parameter | Value | | MCS | MCS17 | | Rank | 2 | | Antenna configuration | 2\*2; 2\*4 | | Ds and Dmin | Ds = 700 m, Dmin =150m | |
| R4-2204735 | Samsung | Proposal 4: Introduce PDSCH requirements for HST SFN scenario with SFN scheme A and scheme B with following test applicability rules:   * If UE pass HST-SFN scheme A test cases, UE can skip HST-SFN scheme B test cases   Proposal 5: No dedicated PDCCH test case for SFN transmission schemes; Define test case when both channels (PDSCH/PDCCH) are transmitted using SFN scheme A and verify performance of PDSCH only (option 3).  Proposal 6: Do not define PDSCH CA requirements for HST SFN scenario (option 2).  Proposal 7: Reusing existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as baseline to introduce enhanced SFN scheme A and SFN scheme B PDSCH test cases with below update:   * SFN scheme A (UE based solution): two TCI states with QCL A type information included   + PDCCH/PDSCH/PBCH SFN transmitted from two RRHs   + TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately   + HST SFN channel model specified in B.3.2 of TS 38.101-4 reused * SFN scheme B (TRP based pre-compensation solution): two TCI states with one configured QCL type A information, and another one configured QCL Type B information’   + PDCCH/PDSCH/PBCH SFN transmitted from two RRHs   + TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately   + HST SFN channel model specified in B.3.2 of TS 38.101-4 reused without modelling Doppler shift |
| R4-2205428 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Option 2: Introduce only PDSCH requirements for SFN scheme A.  Proposal 2: Option 2: Do not define PDSCH CA requirements for HST-SFN scenario.  Proposal 3: If the PDCCH requirement for non-HST SFN scenario is excluded then consider the necessity of introducing PDCCH requirement for HST-SFN scenario.  Proposal 4: For PDSCH demodulation requirements with HST-SFN Scheme A, set 870Hz for SCS=15kHz and 1660Hz for SCS=30kHz.  Proposal 5: For PDSCH demodulation requirements with HST-SFN Scheme A, set MCS13 Rank 2.  Proposal 6: For HST-SFN Scheme A, reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m, v=500km/h) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP.  Proposal 7: Confirm the assumption that the HST-SFN advanced receiver is the baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement.  Proposal 8: The PDSCH demodulation requirements for HST-SFN Scheme A is applicable for UE capable of ‘SFN Scheme A’. |
| R4-2205774 | Huawei | Observation 1: Better performance can be achieved for Scheme B comparing to the normal SFN.  Observation 2: There is large UE performance difference for Scheme B between different BS implementation of frequency offset between two TRP.  Proposal 1: Define PDSCH performance requirements for Scheme B for HST scenario.  Proposal 2: For Scheme B, BS behaviour can be oppler into channel model so that TE implementation of pre-compensation has no impact on the UE performance during the test.  Proposal 3: Do not define any PDCCH requirements for HST scenario but define PDCCH requirements for Scheme A for non-HST scenario.  Proposal 4: Do not consider CA requirements for HST SFN scenario.  Proposal 5: For Scheme A, transmit TRS#i from RRH#4k+I that i = 0, 1, 2, 3 and k = 0, 1, 2, … .  Proposal 6: For the maximum Doppler shift for Scheme A, reuse the value from Rel-16 HST-SFN, i.e. 870Hz for 15kHz, 1667Hz for 30kHz.  Proposal 7: Select MCS17 with Rank 2 for Scheme A performance requirements definition.  Proposal 8: For the channel model for Scheme A, reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP.  Proposal 9: Select MCS17 with Rank 2 for Scheme B performance requirements definition.  Proposal 10: For Scheme A, transmit TRS#i from RRH#4k+i that i = 0, 1, 2, 3 and k = 0, 1, 2, … .  Proposal 11: Configure the following four TCI codepoint during the test:   * Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k and RRH#4k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1 * Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+1 and RRH#4k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2 * Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+2 and RRH#4k+3: TCI#2, TCI#3 * Codepoint#3 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+3 and RRH#4(k+1): TCI#3, TCI#0   Proposal 12: For the channel model for Scheme B, reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP. |
| R4-2205920 | Intel | Proposal 1: Define demodulation performance requirements for SFN Scheme A only for FR1  Proposal 2: Define demodulation performance requirements for SFN Scheme A for CA.  Proposal 3: Do not define demodulation performance requirements for SFN Scheme B. |
| R4-2206100 | Qualcomm | Proposal 1: The difference between the estimated Dopplers for TRP#1 (i.e., estimated from TRS1) and TRP#2 (i.e., estimated from TRS2) should be within the TRS-based tracking pull-in range with some margin.  Proposal 2: The resultant maximum delay spread estimated at the UE side from two TRSs should be within the length of the cyclic prefix.  Proposal 3: Rel-17 HST model should include path-loss for TRS of each TRP separately and apply the same scaling as PDSCH for each TRP  Proposal 4: Rel-17 HST model should assume delay for TRS of each TRP separately and apply the same delay as PDSCH for each TRP  Proposal 5: Rel-17 HST should assume only two RRHs (representing TRP#1 and TRP#2) transmitting simultaneously.  Proposal 6: The simulation assumptions for HST scheme A should not assume SFN transmission for PBCH/SSB. |

## Open issues summary

Last RAN4 meeting agreeements in the WF R4-2203090/91/92

List of open issues

* Sub-topic 2-1 Test Scope
  + Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario
  + Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme B
  + Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scenario
* Sub-topic 2-2 Test setup for PDCCH requirement for Enhancement on Multi-TRP if introduced
  + Issue 2-2-1: Multi-TRP repetition transmission schemes for PDCCH requirements
  + Issue 2-2-2: Number of TCI code point for Test
  + Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift
  + Issue 2-2-4: MCS and Rank
  + Issue 2-2-5: Channel Model
  + Issue 2-2-6: Baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement
  + Issue 2-2-7: UE capability
  + Issue 2-2-8: Performance evaluation
* Sub-topic 2-3 Test setup for PDSCH requirement for SFN scheme B with Single Carrier If introduced
  + Issue 2-3-1: Common setup for PDSCH requirement
  + Issue 2-3-2: Number of TCI code point for Test
  + Issue 2-3-3: Maximum Doppler shift
  + Issue 2-3-4: MCS and Rank
  + Issue 2-3-5: Channel Model

### Sub-topic 2-1: Test Scope

**Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Huawei): Do not define any PDCCH requirements for HST scenario but define PDCCH requirements for Scheme A for non-HST scenario.
  + Option 2(Apple, Samsung): Define test case when both channels (PDSCH/PDCCH) are transmitted using SFN scheme A and verify performance of PDSCH only
  + Option 3(Ericsson): If the PDCCH requirement for non-HST SFN scenario is excluded then consider the necessity of introducing PDCCH requirement for HST-SFN scenario.
* Recommended WF
  + No PDCCH requirement for Enhancement on HST-SFN scenario.
  + Define test case where both channels (PDSCH/PDCCH) are transmitted using SFN scheme and verify performance of PDSCH only

**Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requireemnt with HST-SFN scheme B**

* Observations
  + Observation 1(NTTDoCoMO):
    - As for Maximum Doppler shift of Rel-17 HST-SFN scheme B, we would like to clarify how to treat the pre-compensation first. (If RAN4 agrees to introduce the requirement of HST-SFN scheme B)
  + Observation 2(Huawei):
    - Better performance can be achieved for Scheme B comparing to the normal SFN.
    - There is large UE performance difference for Scheme B between different BS implementation of frequency offset between two TRP
  + Observation 3 (Intel):
    - Conventional receiver leads to 2 dB and 1.1 dB performance degradation with 0 and 752Hz residual frequency error compared to HST-SFN receiver.
* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung, Huawei, CMCC): Yes
  + Option 2 (Apple, Intel, Ericsson): No
  + Option 3 (CMCC): do not introduce PDSCH requirements for SFN scheme B and define the following test applicability rule to guarantee performance with this scheme:
    - If UE passes the existing test cases (demodulation requirement for HST-SFN with high Doppler shift), the performance of SFN scheme B is guaranteed
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scnearion**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Apple, Huawei, Samsung, Ericsson): Only define PDSCH requirements for HST SFN scenario with single carrier requirement in Rel-17
  + Option 2 (Intel): Define PDSCH CA requirements for HST SFN scenario
  + Option 3 (CMCC): For HST-SFN, define single carrier requirement firstly. If time allowed, PDSCH CA requirements for HST SFN scenario can be considered later.
* Recommended WF
  + No PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI.

### Sub-topic 2-2: Test setup for PDSCH requirement for SFN scheme A with Single Carrier

**Issue 2-2-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung, NTT DoCoMo, Apple, Ericsson, CMCC): Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline
    - PDCCH/PDSCH SFN transmitted from two RRHs
    - TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | |
| FDD 15 kHz SCS | TDD 30 kHz SCS |
| CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 | |
| DMRS type | Type 1 | |
| Number of DMRS symbols | 1+1+1 | |
| TDD pattern |  | 7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U |
| TRS configuration | 10ms, 2 slot pattern | |
| PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 | |
| Ds and Dmin | Ds =700m; Dmin=150m | |
| Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput | |

* + Option 2 (Qualcomm): The simulation assumption for HST scheme A should not assume SFN transmission for PBCH/SSB
* Recommended WF
  + Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline
    - PDCCH/PDSCH SFN transmitted from two RRHs.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | |
| FDD 15 kHz SCS | TDD 30 kHz SCS |
| CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 | |
| DMRS type | Type 1 | |
| Number of DMRS symbols | 1+1+1 | |
| TDD pattern |  | 7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U |
| TRS configuration | 10ms, 2 slot pattern | |
| PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 | |
| Ds and Dmin | Ds =700m; Dmin=150m | |
| Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput | |

**Issue 2-2-2: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung): TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately
  + Option 2 (Huawei): Configure 4 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#4k+i that i = 0, 1, 2, 3 and k = 0, 1, 2, … .
    - Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k and RRH#4k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1
    - Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+1 and RRH#4k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2
    - Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+2 and RRH#4k+3: TCI#2, TCI#3
    - Codepoint#3 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+3 and RRH#4(k+1): TCI#3, TCI#0
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift**

* Proposals for 15 KHz SCS:
  + Option 1 (Samsung, Apple, CMCC, Intel, Ericsson. Huawei): 870 Hz
  + Option 2 (NTTDoCoMO): 972 Hz
  + Option 3 (Qualcomm): The difference between the estimated Dopplers for TRP#1 (i.e., estimated from TRS1) and TRP#2 (i.e., estimated from TRS2) should be within the TRS-based tracking pull-in range with some margin.
* Proposals for 30KHz SCS
  + Option 1(Samsung, Apple, CMCC, Intel, Ericsson. Huawei, NTTDoCoMO ): 1667 Hz
  + Option 2(Qualcomm): The difference between the estimated Dopplers for TRP#1 (i.e., estimated from TRS1) and TRP#2 (i.e., estimated from TRS2) should be within the TRS-based tracking pull-in range with some margin.
* Recommended WF
  + Define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme A with Maximum Doppler shift
    - 15KHz: 870Hz
    - 30KHz: 1667Hz

**Issue 2-2-4: MCS and Rank**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung, Apple, NTT DoCoMo, CMCC, Intel, Huawei): MCS 17 with Rank 2
  + Option 2 (Ericsson): MCS 13 with Rank 2
* Recommended WF
  + Define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme A with MCS 17 and Rank 2 from MCS Table 1

**Issue 2-2-5: Channel Model**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung, Apple, Huawei, Ericsson, Qualcomm ): Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP
    - Option 1a (Apple): For PDCCH and PDCCH HST-SFN channel model with 2 nearest RRH – time varying path power and path delay. For TRS from each RRH single tap with time varying path power and path delay
    - Option 1b(Qualcomm):
* The resultant maximum delay spread estimated at the UE side from two TRSs should be within the length of the cyclic prefix.
* Rel-17 HST model should include path-loss for TRS of each TRP separately and apply the same scaling as PDSCH for each TRP
* Rel-17 HST model should assume delay for TRS of each TRP separately and apply the same delay as PDSCH for each TRP
* Recommended WF
  + Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP as baseline
  + For PDCCH and PDSCH HST-SFN with 2 nearest RRH, including time varying path power and path delay
  + For TRS, single tap from each RRH, including time varying path power and path delay, apply the same scaling as PDSCH for each TRP for path power, and apply the same same delay as PDSCH for each TRP for path delay

**Issue 2-2-6: Baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson): Confirm the assumption that the HST-SFN advanced receiver is the baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 2-2-7: UE capabilty**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Ericsson): The PDSCH demodulation requirements for HST-SFN Scheme A is applicable for UE capable of ‘SFN Scheme A’.
* Recommended WF
  + The PDSCH demodulation requirements for HST-SFN scheme A is applicable of “SFN scheme A”. No additional UE capability was introduced in RAN4 for PDSCH demodulation requirement for HST-SFN

**Issue 2-2-8: Performance evalution**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Apple): Evaluate performance improvement of HST SFN scheme A over Rel-16 HST SFN.
* Recommended WF
  + Please proponents of proposal clarify the intension of performance evaluation for Rel-16 HST SFN in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI, considering different RAN1 design, UE baseband processing and channel model

### Sub-topic 2-3: Test setup for PDSCH requirement for SFN scheme B with Single Carrier If introduced

**Issue 2-3-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung): Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline
    - two TCI states with one configured QCL type A information, and another one configured QCL Type B information’
    - TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | |
| FDD 15 kHz SCS | TDD 30 kHz SCS |
| CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 | |
| DMRS type | Type 1 | |
| Number of DMRS symbols | 1+1+1 | |
| TDD pattern |  | 7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U |
| TRS configuration | 10ms, 2 slot pattern | |
| PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 | |
| Ds and Dmin | Ds =700m; Dmin=150m | |
| Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput | |

* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 2-3-2: Modeling of TRP pre-compensation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Huawei): For scheme B, BS behaviour can beopplerd into channel model so that TE implementation of pre-compensation has no impact on the UE performance during the test.
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 2-3-3: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung): TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately
  + Option 2 (Huawei): Configure 4 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#4k+i that i = 0, 1, 2, 3 and k = 0, 1, 2, … .
    - Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k and RRH#4k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1
    - Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+1 and RRH#4k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2
    - Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+2 and RRH#4k+3: TCI#2, TCI#3
    - Codepoint#3 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+3 and RRH#4(k+1): TCI#3, TCI#0
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 2-3-4: MCS and Rank**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung, Huawei): MCS 17 with Rank 2
* Recommended WF
  + Define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme B with MCS 17 and Rank 2 from MCS Table 1

**Issue 2-3-5: Channel Model**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung, Huawei)
    - Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP as baseline
    - HST SFN channel model specified in B.3.2 of TS 38.101-4 reused without modelling Doppler shift
* Recommended WF
  + Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP as baseline
  + For PDCCH and PDSCH HST-SFN with 2 nearest RRH, including time varying path power and path delay, without modelling Doppler shift
  + For TRS, single tap from each RRH, including time varying path power and path delay, apply the same scaling as PDSCH for each TRP for path power, and apply the same delay as PDSCH for each TRP for path delay, without modelling Doppler shift

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub topic 2-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 2-1-1  Issue 2-1-2  Issue 2-1-3 |
| Intel | **Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**  Support the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requireemnt with HST-SFN scheme B**  After BS performs frequency pre-compensation, channel model becomes much simplier than HST-SFN. It is two/four tap model when there are no taps with huge Doppler frequency magnitudes and different sign. The Doppler frequency magnitudes are the same or considering Tx frequency error are different on some ceratin value that is in the worst case limited by 0.4 PPM. Considering this channel model, conventioanl UE receiver with Jakes spectrum assumptions + conventional TRS based frequency tracking can be used. According to our evaluations, performance difference between scenarios with HST-SFN receiver and conventional receiver is limited by 2 dB. We expect that some further adjustment can be made for conventional reciever.  Since conventional receiver can be used on UE side, we do not see a big impact on UE implementation. Support option 2.  **Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scnearion**  We are fine to compromise to Option 1, hence we support the recomened WF. |
| Apple | **Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**  We are fine with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requireemnt with HST-SFN scheme B**  We support option 2. With pre-compensation the UE doesn’t need advanced receiver/ processing and should be like single tap HST in our understanding. Hence, we don’t see the need to introduce requirements.  **Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scnearion**  We are fine with the recommended WF. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**  We are okay with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requireemnt with HST-SFN scheme B**  Option 2. Assuming PDSCH is Doppler pre-compensated, our understanding is that it does not impact the UE side processing in a meaningful way, e.g., even in the presence of residual error. Therefore, we don’t think it is necessary to define requirements for Scheme B.  **Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scnearion**  We support the recommended WF. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**  Ok with recommended WF.  **Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme B**  We are ok to evaluate Scheme B, since the pre-compensation assumed by RAN1 is only for Doppler shift from the 2nd RRH but gNB does not compensate the time difference between two RRHs. As some companies commented, it is like two-tap channel model with almost same Doppler shift. We  believe UE can receive with the Rel-15 receiver as far as the time difference between two taps are within a CP. However we would like to evaluate this scenario (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) especially for SCS 30kHz.  **Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scenario**  We support the recommended WF. |
| Mediatek | **Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**  We support Option 2 not to define PDCCH requirement on HST-SFN scenario.  **Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requireemnt with HST-SFN scheme B**  We support Option 2 not to define PDSCH requirement for HST-SFN scheme B.  **Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scnearion**  We support the recommended WF not to define PDSCH CA requirement. |
| Huawei | **Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requireemnt with HST-SFN scheme B**  We prefer Option 1. For Rel-17 SFN scheme B, UE is configured with two set of delay-related parameters corresponding to different TCI state and one set of Doppler-related parameters corresponding to the reference TCI state. Considering different TRS configuration, maybe different UE processing is expected comparing to the Rel-16 DPS.  **Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scnearion**  OK with the recommended WF. |
| CMCC | **Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**  OK with recommended WF.  **Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requireemnt with HST-SFN scheme B**  Our preference is option 1. Option 3 is a compromise way to move forward. Our consideration is that with this approach of pre-compensation at gNB, the doppler frequency shift experienced by UE is not so large, but it is noted that there is still residual doppler shift. Since UE still need to handle multi-path with doppler shift, it is better to guarantee UE demodulation performance.  **Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scnearion**  Fine with the recommended WF. |
| Samsung | **Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**  Ok with recommended WF  **Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme B**  Support option 1  In Rel-16 HST-SFN, same TRS signal with single TCI state transmitted from two RRHs, UE need to enable advanced receiver to blindly detect channel parameters including Doppler shift and time delay information for two RRHs  From UE implementation aspect, no advanced receiver required for both SFN scheme A and scheme B compared to Rel-15 transparent joint transmission scheme under HST-SFN scenario. UE can detect channel information from two RRHs based separate TRS signals associated with different TCI states.  From UE feature aspect, supporting HST scheme A, HST-SFN scheme B and traditional transparent SFN schemes under HST\_SFN channel are different features.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 23. NR\_FeMIMO | 23-6-1 | SFN scheme A (scheme 1) for PDSCH and PDCCH | 1. ~~[~~Support of SFN scheme A for PDCCH~~]~~ scheduling [single TRP/] SFN Scheme A PDSCH ~~and~~ [and default QCL assumption with one or two TCI states for PDCCH]  ~~2. Support of SFN scheme A for PDSCH [only scheduled by [single TRP/ Scheme A] PDCCH] [and default QCL assumption with one or two TCI states for PDSCH]~~ |  |  |  |  | [Per band or per FS or FSPC] |  |  |  |  | Optional with capability signalling | | 23. NR\_FeMIMO | 23-6-1a | Dynamic switching–- scheme A | Support of dynamic switching between single-TRP and ~~SFN~~ PDSCH SFN scheme A by TCI state field in DCI formats 1\_1, 1\_2 | [23-6-1[b]] |  |  |  | [Per band or per FS or FSPC] |  |  |  |  | Optional with capability signalling | | 23. NR\_FeMIMO | 23-6-1b | SFN scheme A (scheme 1) for PDSCH only | 1. Support of SFN scheme A for PDSCH [only scheduled by [single TRP/ Scheme A] PDCCH] [and default QCL assumption with one or two TCI states for PDSCH] |  |  |  |  | [Per band or per FS or FSPC] |  |  |  |  | Optional with capability signalling | | 23. NR\_FeMIMO | 23-6-2 | SFN scheme B (TRP based pre-compensation) for PDSCH and PDCCH | 1. ~~[~~Support of SFN scheme B for PDCCH~~]~~ scheduling SFN Scheme B PDSCH [and default QCL assumption with one or two TCI states for PDCCH]  ~~2. Support of SFN scheme B for PDSCH only [and default QCL assumption with two TCI states for PDSCH] [scheduled by [single TRP/Scheme B] PDCCH]~~ | [23-6-1] |  |  |  | [Per band or per FS or per FSPC] |  | ~~[FR1 only]~~ |  |  | Optional with capability signalling | | 23. NR\_FeMIMO | 23-6-2a | Dynamic switching–- scheme B | Support of dynamic switching between single-TRP and ~~SFN~~ PDSCH SFN scheme B by TCI state field in DCI formats 1\_1, 1\_2 | [23-6-2[b]] |  |  |  | [Per band or per FS or FSPC] |  |  |  |  | Optional with capability signalling | | 23. NR\_FeMIMO | 23-6-2b | SFN scheme B (TRP based pre-compensation) for PDSCH only | 1. Support of SFN scheme B for PDSCH [only and default QCL assumption with two TCI states for PDSCH] [scheduled by [single TRP/Scheme B] PDCCH] | [23-6-1] |  |  |  | [Per band or per FS or per FSPC] |  |  |  |  | Optional with capability signalling |   For SFN-Scheme A, UE need to simultaneously track two TCI states with QCL type- A information (5 channel parameters each RRH, with total 10 parameters) including Doppler shift and delay information from two RRHs.  For SFN-Scheme B, UE need to simultaneously track two TCI states with QCL Type –A for one TCI state and another TCI state with only {average delay, delay spread} information (total 7 parameters).  From UE processing aspect, it’s different between Scheme-A and Scheme-B. Also from UE feature list aspect, these two schemes are separate UE features.  Therefore, we think both requirement should be defined, the test applicable rule can be introduced to reduce the test effort, as if UE pass HST-SFN scheme A test cases, UE can skip HST-SFN scheme B test cases  To Apple, QC, MTK, and Intel  With Scheme B, even with BS pre-compensation, UE still need to track delay parameters for each RRH, different with single-tap, there is not propagation delay considered. For SFN scenario, the time different between RRH is close to the CP length, it is necessary to define requirement to verify the proper time tracking  As per RAN1 UE feature list, scheme A and scheme B are different UE features, UE may or may not support scheme A how the test coverage cannot be guaranteed.?  We can introduce the test applicable rule to reduce the test effort  **Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scenario**  Ok with recommended WF |

Sub topic 2-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| SoftBank | Issue 2-2-3: We support Option 2 for 15kHz SCS, proposed by NTT DoCoMo. We are fine with Option 1 for 30kHz SCS. |
| DoCoMo | Issue 2-2-1  We are ok with the recommended WF.  Issue 2-2-3  For 15KHz, our preference is still 972Hz (Option2).  As we describe in our contribution, Rel-17 HST-SFN scheme A can support 972Hz because UE can track the Doppler shift per each RRH and need not track the Doppler shift jump that is observed in Rel-16 HST-SFN. In addition, from the perspective of Japanese operators, it is important to support Band 1 as well as LTE.  For 30KHz, we are ok with 1667Hz (Option1).  Issue 2-2-4  We are basically fine with the recommended WF. But we would like to focus on Issue 2-2-3 first. |
| Apple | **Issue 2-2-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  We support the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-2: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**  Option 2. We agree that we need 4 TCI code points.  **Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift**  We support option 1 for both 15KHz SCS and 30KHz SCS. We cannot agree to use highopplerr shift without seeing some initial results. Using the same assumptions as HST-SFN is a starting point.  **Issue 2-2-5: Channel Model**  Fine with recommended WF. The time-varying Doppler shift on TRS from each TRP should also match that on PDSCH/PDCCH.  **Issue 2-2-6: Baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement**  We are not sure what the proposal means. The UE needs different processing that HST-SFN for scheme A. This is very different from HST-SFN. We have PDSCH/PDCCH associated with 2 TCI states now. Could the proponents please explain how same receiver can be assumed?  **Issue 2-2-7: UE capabilty**  We understand that there is a UE feature from RAN1 for this. Its very early to discuss if additional capability is needed or not in our opinion. We cannot preclude this at this stage.  **Issue 2-2-8: Performance evalution**  We understand that its different feature and processing. Since we are just introducing requirements for RAN1 feature/ enh we understand that we need not compare performance. Since its an enhancement we think it would be interesting to see the performance comparison over existing HST transmission scheme. We are not sure if RAN1 used Rel-16 HST\_SFN in their evaluation. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 2-2-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  We support the recommended WF as the initial simulation assumptions.  **Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift**  We support the recommend WF.  We think that the difference between the estimated Dopplers for TRP#1 (i.e., estimated from TRS1) and TRP#2 (i.e., estimated from TRS2) should be within the TRS-based tracking pull-in range with some margin, therefore option 1 is safer for 15KHz.  **Issue 2-2-4: MCS and Rank**  We support the recommended the WF.  **Issue 2-2-5: Channel Model**  We are okay with recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-6: Baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement**  Could the proponent of this proposal clarify which receiver the “HST-SFN advanced receiver” is pointing to? Rel-17 HST-SFN assumes non-SFN TRS and will require very different processing at the UE side compared to that of Rel-16 HST-SFN where TRS is assumed to be transmitted in an SFN fashion. Therefore, our understanding is that Rel-16 receiver can’t be assumed as a baseline if this is what this proposal is referring to.  **Issue 2-2-7: UE capabilty**  As far as we are aware, RAN1 has yet to finalize UE capability for Scheme A Therefore we think that it is too early to discuss this proposal in RAN4.  **Issue 2-2-8: Performance evalution**  Our understanding is that UE processing and channel model are different for Scheme A compared to the implementation of Rel-16 HST-SFN. While companies can do their internal evaluation and compare performance against Rel-16 HST-SFN to gain further insight, we think that performance evaluation and requirement for scheme A should not consider that of Rel-16 HST-SFN. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-2-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  Ok with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-2: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**  It depends on the channel model in Issue 2-2-5. If we agree to specify the channel model based on two RRHs, we think it is sufficient to configure **three** TRS configurations? (Two TRS for two active RRHs and one TRS for the coming RRH).  **Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift**  For 15kHz SCS: we support 972Hz.  For 30kHz SCS: we support 1667Hz.  It looks most companies prefer to MCS17 rank 2 for Rel-17 HST-SFN in Issue 2-2-4, which is higher MCS compared with Rel-16 test setup (MCS13 rank 2). We are fine to configure higher MCS. In this case, we also propose to set higher Doppler shift of 972Hz for SCS 15kHz since UE can estimate Doppler shift per RRH.  **Issue 2-2-4: MCS and Rank**  Ok with option 1. Our intention is to reuse the Rel-16 HST-SFN test setup. But we are also fine with higher MCS options.  **Issue 2-2-5: Channel Model**  Ok with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-6: Baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement**  Support Option 1 with more clarification.  “Confirm the assumption that the **Rel-16** HST-SFN advanced receiver is the baseline receiver for defining **Rel-17 HST-SFN s**cheme A requirement”  **Issue 2-2-7: UE capability**  Support the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-8: Performance evaluation**  If RAN4 will evaluate the performance gain of Scheme A from Rel-16, we should set the same MCS condition, i.e., MCS13, rank 2. |
| Mediatek | **Issue 2-2-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  We are ok with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift**  We are ok with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-4: MCS and Rank**  We are ok with the recommended WF. |
| Huawei | **Issue 2-2-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-2: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**  Option 2.  **Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift**  OK with the recommended WF. The maximum Doppler jump should be within the maximum UE capability for FOE based on TRS, so same Doppler value should be reused from the legacy SFN cases.  **Issue 2-2-4: MCS and Rank**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-5: Channel Model**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-6: Baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement**  From our understanding, the detailed UE processing is up to UE implementation. Considering different TRS configuration, maybe different UE processing is expected comparing to the Rel-16 normal SFN. We propose to perform simulation firstly to see whether the simulation results can be aligned and if not, then the baseline receiver can be selected for alignment for requirements definition only.  **Issue 2-2-7: UE capabilty**  We can discuss this issue later.  **Issue 2-2-8: Performance evalution**  Based on our evaluation, Rel-17 SFN schemeA has a great performance gain comparing to the normal SFN. Also MCS 17 with rank2 can be achieved for Rel-17 SFN schemeA, but based on RAN4 agreements in Rel-16, MCS 17 with rank2 cannot achieved for normal SFN. |
| CMCC | **Issue 2-2-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  Support the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift**  Support the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-4: MCS and Rank**  Support the recommended WF. |
| Samsung | Issue 2-2-1  Ok with recommended  Issue 2-2-2  Since only two RRHs is considered in the channel model, we think 2 active TCIs should be available, at most 3 TCI states should be configured,  Issue 2-2-3  Ok with recommended WF, similar as Rel-16 HST SFN  Issue 2-2-4  OK with recommended WF  Issue 2-2-5  Ok with recommended WF  Issue 2-2-6  To Ericsson  In our understanding, In Rel-15, same TRS signal with single TCI state transmitted from two RRHs, UE need to enable advanced receiver to blindly detect channel parameters including Doppler shift and time delay information for two RRHs.  While for Rel-17 HST-SFN, there is no advanced receiver required for both SFN scheme A and scheme B compared to Rel-15 transparent joint transmission scheme under HST-SFN scenario. UE can detect channel information from two RRHs based separate TRS signals associated with different TCI states.  Meanwhile UE with HST-SFN advanced receiver is pending on UE capability, UE can support scheme A or scheme B, it cannot support HST-SFN advanced receiver, how to handle this UE ?  Issue 2-2-7  We can discuss later , based on current RAN1 agreement for FeMIMO features, it seems that option 1 can be agreeable   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 23. NR\_FeMIMO | 23-6-1 | SFN scheme A (scheme 1) for PDSCH and PDCCH | 1. ~~[~~Support of SFN scheme A for PDCCH~~]~~ scheduling [single TRP/] SFN Scheme A PDSCH ~~and~~ [and default QCL assumption with one or two TCI states for PDCCH]  ~~2. Support of SFN scheme A for PDSCH [only scheduled by [single TRP/ Scheme A] PDCCH] [and default QCL assumption with one or two TCI states for PDSCH]~~ |  |  |  |  | [Per band or per FS or FSPC] |  |  |  |  | Optional with capability signalling |   Issue 2-2-8  Since the channel mode and UE processing are different for Rel-16 HST-SFN and Rel-17 HST-SFN, we just wonder what the purpose to performance evaluation compassion is. From performance gain aspect, in our understanding, RAN1 has done the similar evaluation. From RAN4 demodulation requirement, aspect, we just define requirement with proper test setup to verify the UE proper receiver based on RAN1 feature.  May be we can say, “interesting companies can provide the performance comparison between Rel-16 HST SFN and Rel-17 HST SFN” |

Sub topic 2-3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 2-3-1  Issue 2-3-2  Issue 2-3-3  Issue 2-3-4  Issue 2-3-5 |
| Huawei | **Issue 2-3-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  For the Number of TCI codepoint for Test, discussion in Issue 2-3-3 should be applied. We are OK with the other part of Option 1.  **Issue 2-3-2: Modeling of TRP pre-compensation**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-3-3: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**  Option 2.  **Issue 2-3-4: MCS and Rank**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-3-5: Channel Model**  OK with the recommended WF. |
| CMCC | **Issue 2-3-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  OK with the recommended WF. |
| Samsung | Issue 2-3-1  We support option1, we are ok to further discuss number of TCI state configured pending on issue 2-3-3  Issue 2-3-2  In general, we are ok with option 1, for this test, we can assume there is no Doppler shift in the channel model, only considering the power and path delay for each RRH based on HST SFN channel model  Issue 2-3-3  Since only two RRHs is considered in the channel model, we think 2 active TCIs should be available, at most 3 TCI states should be configured,  Issue 2-3-4  Ok with recommended WF  Issue 2-3-5  Ok with recommended WF |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize wIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing wIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic #2-1** | **Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Huawei): Do not define any PDCCH requirements for HST scenario but define PDCCH requirements for Scheme A for non-HST scenario.   + Option 2(Apple, Samsung, Intel, Qualcomm, Ericsson, MTK, Huawei, CMCC): Define test case when both channels (PDSCH/PDCCH) are transmitted using SFN scheme A and verify performance of PDSCH only   + Option 3(Ericsson): If the PDCCH requirement for non-HST SFN scenario is excluded then consider the necessity of introducing PDCCH requirement for HST-SFN scenario.   *Tentative agreements:*   * No PDCCH requirement for Enhancement on HST-SFN scenario. * Define test case where both channels (PDSCH/PDCCH) are transmitted using SFN scheme and verify performance of PDSCH only   **Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requireemnt with HST-SFN scheme B**   * Proposals   + Option 1(Samsung, Huawei, CMCC, Ericsson): Yes     - Option 1a (Samsung): scheme A and scheme B with test applicability rule: If UE pass HST-SFN scheme A test cases, UE can skip HST-SFN scheme B test cases   + Option 2 (Apple, Intel, Qualcomm, MTK): No   + Option 3 (CMCC): do not introduce PDSCH requirements for SFN scheme B and define the following test applicability rule to guarantee performance with this scheme:     - If UE passes the existing test cases (demodulation requirement for HST-SFN with high Doppler shift), the performance of SFN scheme B is guaranteed   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Encourage comments if any * Encourage companies to further discuss with following aspects   + UE feature list with HST SFN scheme A and scheme B   + Channel model with scheme A and scheme B   + QCL type with two TCI states for scheme A and scheme B   + UE receiver processing with scheme A and scheme B   + Channel model with scheme B compared with single tap HST or DPS   + UE receiver processing of scheme B compared with single tap HST or DPS   **Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scnearion**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Apple, Huawei, Samsung, Ericsson, Intel (Comprise ), Qualcomm, MTK, CMCC): Only define PDSCH requirements for HST SFN scenario with single carrier requirement in Rel-17   + Option 2 (Intel): Define PDSCH CA requirements for HST SFN scenario   + Option 3 (CMCC): For HST-SFN, define single carrier requirement firstly. If time allowed, PDSCH CA requirements for HST SFN scenario can be considered later.   *Tentative agreements:*   * No PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI. |
| **Sub-topic #2-2** | **Issue 2-2-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung): Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline     - PDCCH/PDSCH SFN transmitted from two RRHs     - TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Parameter | Value | | | FDD 15 kHz SCS | TDD 30 kHz SCS | | CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz | | Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 | | | DMRS type | Type 1 | | | Number of DMRS symbols | 1+1+1 | | | TDD pattern |  | 7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U | | TRS configuration | 10ms, 2 slot pattern | | | PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 | | | Ds and Dmin | Ds =700m; Dmin=150m | | | Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput | |  * + Option 2 (Qualcomm): The simulation assumption for HST scheme A should not assume SFN transmission for PBCH/SSB   *Tentative agreements:*   * Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline (Samsung, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Huawei, Intel, MTK, CMMC, NTTDoCoMO)   + PDCCH/PDSCH SFN transmitted from two RRHs.  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Parameter | Value | | | FDD 15 kHz SCS | TDD 30 kHz SCS | | CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz | | Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 | | | DMRS type | Type 1 | | | Number of DMRS symbols | 1+1+1 | | | TDD pattern |  | 7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U | | TRS configuration | 10ms, 2 slot pattern | | | PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 | | | Ds and Dmin | Ds =700m; Dmin=150m | | | Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput | |   **Issue 2-2-2: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung): TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately   + Option 2 (Huawei, Apple): Configure 4 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#4k+i that i = 0, 1, 2, 3 and k = 0, 1, 2, … .     - Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k and RRH#4k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1     - Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+1 and RRH#4k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2     - Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+2 and RRH#4k+3: TCI#2, TCI#3     - Codepoint#3 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+3 and RRH#4(k+1): TCI#3, TCI#0   + Option 3 (Ericsson, Samsung): Configure 3 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#3k+i that i = 0, 1, 2 and k = 0, 1, 2, … based on two RRHs     - Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k and RRH#3k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1     - Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k+2 and RRH#3k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2     - Codepoint#3 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k+2 and RRH#3k+2: TCI#2, TCI#0   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Encourage comments if any   **Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals for 15 KHz SCS:   + Option 1 (Samsung, Apple, CMCC, Intel. Huawei, Qualcomm, MTK): 870 Hz   + Option 2 (NTTDoCoMO, Softbank, Ericsson): 972 Hz   + Option 3 (Qualcomm): The difference between the estimated Dopplers for TRP#1 (i.e., estimated from TRS1) and TRP#2 (i.e., estimated from TRS2) should be within the TRS-based tracking pull-in range with some margin. * Proposals for 30KHz SCS   + Option 1(Samsung, Apple, CMCC, Intel, Ericsson. Huawei, NTTDoCoMO, Qualcomm, MTK, Softbank ): 1667 Hz   + Option 2(Qualcomm): The difference between the estimated Dopplers for TRP#1 (i.e., estimated from TRS1) and TRP#2 (i.e., estimated from TRS2) should be within the TRS-based tracking pull-in range with some margin.   *Tentative agreements:*   * Define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme A with Maximum Doppler shift   + 30KHz SCS: 1667Hz   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Maximum Doppler shift for 15KHz SCS   + Option 1: 972 Hz   + Option 2: 840Hz * Companies are encouraged to bring simulation results with both option 1 and option 2 to check whether there is performance degradation with option 1, down selection one of them in the next meeting.   **Issue 2-2-4: MCS and Rank**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung, Apple, NTT DoCoMo, CMCC, Intel, Huawei, Ericsson, Qualcomm, MTK): MCS 17 with Rank 2   + Option 2 (Ericsson): MCS 13 with Rank 2   *Tentative agreements:*   * Define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme A with MCS 17 and Rank 2 from MCS Table 1   **Issue 2-2-5: Channel Model**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung, Apple, Huawei, Ericsson, Qualcomm ): Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP     - Option 1a (Apple): For PDCCH and PDCCH HST-SFN channel model with 2 nearest RRH – time varying path power and path delay. For TRS from each RRH single tap with time varying path power and path delay     - Option 1b(Qualcomm): * The resultant maximum delay spread estimated at the UE side from two TRSs should be within the length of the cyclic prefix. * Rel-17 HST model should include path-loss for TRS of each TRP separately and apply the same scaling as PDSCH for each TRP * Rel-17 HST model should assume delay for TRS of each TRP separately and apply the same delay as PDSCH for each TRP   *Tentative agreements:*   * Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP as baseline * For PDCCH and PDSCH HST-SFN with 2 nearest RRH, including time varying path power and path delay * For TRS, single tap from each RRH, including time varying path power and path delay, apply the same scaling as PDSCH for each TRP for path power, and apply the same delay as PDSCH for each TRP for path delay, and apply the same time-varying Doppler shift from each RRH as PDCCH/PDSCH for Doppler shift   **Issue 2-2-6: Baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Ericsson): Confirm the assumption that the HST-SFN advanced receiver is the baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement   + Option 2(Qualcomm, Apple, Samsung): Do not assume HST-SFN advanced receiver is the baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Encourage comments if any   **Issue 2-2-7: UE capabilty**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Ericsson): The PDSCH demodulation requirements for HST-SFN Scheme A is applicable for UE capable of ‘SFN Scheme A’.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Pending on conclusion of UE feature list of Rel-17 FeMMO   **Issue 2-2-8: Performance evalution**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Apple): Evaluate performance improvement of HST SFN scheme A over Rel-16 HST SFN.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Interested companies can provide the performance evaluation result of HST SNF scheme A over Rel-16 HST SFN. No impact on the Rel-17 HST SFN scheme A performance requirement definition. |
| **Sub-topic #2-3** | **Issue 2-3-1: Comment setup for PDSCH requirement**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung): Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline     - two TCI states with one configured QCL type A information, and another one configured QCL Type B information’     - TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Parameter | Value | | | FDD 15 kHz SCS | TDD 30 kHz SCS | | CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz | | Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 | | | DMRS type | Type 1 | | | Number of DMRS symbols | 1+1+1 | | | TDD pattern |  | 7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U | | TRS configuration | 10ms, 2 slot pattern | | | PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 | | | Ds and Dmin | Ds =700m; Dmin=150m | | | Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput | |   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Pending on issue 2-1-2   **Issue 2-3-2: Modeling of TRP pre-compensation**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Huawei, Samsung): For scheme B, BS behaviour can be Doppler Modeling into channel model so that TE implementation of pre-compensation has no impact on the UE performance during the test.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Pending on issue 2-1-2   **Issue 2-3-3: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung): TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately   + Option 2 (Huawei): Configure 4 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#4k+i that i = 0, 1, 2, 3 and k = 0, 1, 2, … .     - Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k and RRH#4k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1     - Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+1 and RRH#4k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2     - Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+2 and RRH#4k+3: TCI#2, TCI#3     - Codepoint#3 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+3 and RRH#4(k+1): TCI#3, TCI#0   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Pending on issue 2-1-2   **Issue 2-3-4: MCS and Rank**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung, Huawei): MCS 17 with Rank 2   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Pending on issue 2-1-2   **Issue 2-3-5: Channel Model**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung, Huawei)     - Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP as baseline     - HST SFN channel model specified in B.3.2 of TS 38.101-4 reused without modelling Doppler shift   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Pending on issue 2-1-2 * Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP as baseline * For PDCCH and PDSCH HST-SFN with 2 nearest RRH, including time varying path power and path delay, without modelling Doppler shift * For TRS, single tap from each RRH, including time varying path power and path delay, apply the same scaling as PDSCH for each TRP for path power, and apply the same delay as PDSCH for each TRP for path delay, without modelling Doppler shift |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

**Issue 2-1-1: Whether to define PDCCH requirement for HST SFN scenario**

*Tentative agreement:*

* No PDCCH requirement for Enhancement on HST-SFN scenario.
* Define test case where both channels (PDSCH/PDCCH) are transmitted using SFN scheme and verify performance of PDSCH only

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* Confirm tentative agreement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We are ok with tentative agreement made in 1st round |
| CMCC | OK with the tentative agreement |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement. |
| Intel | We support the tentative agreement. |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement. |
| Ericsson | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Mediatek | OK with the tentative agreement. |

**Issue 2-1-2: Whether to define PDSCH requireemnt with HST-SFN scheme B**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung, Huawei, CMCC, Ericsson): Yes
    - Option 1a (Samsung): scheme A and scheme B with test applicability rule: If UE pass HST-SFN scheme A test cases, UE can skip HST-SFN scheme B test cases
  + Option 2 (Apple, Intel, Qualcomm, MTK): No
  + Option 3 (CMCC): do not introduce PDSCH requirements for SFN scheme B and define the following test applicability rule to guarantee performance with this scheme:
    - If UE passes the existing test cases (demodulation requirement for HST-SFN with high Doppler shift), the performance of SFN scheme B is guaranteed
* Recommended WF
  + ~~Encourage comments if any~~
  + ~~Encourage companies to further discuss with following aspects~~
    - ~~UE feature list with HST SFN scheme A and scheme B~~
    - ~~Channel model with scheme A and scheme B~~
    - ~~QCL type with two TCI states for scheme A and scheme B~~
    - ~~UE receiver processing with scheme A and scheme B~~
    - ~~Channel model with scheme B compared with single tap HST or DPS~~
    - ~~UE receiver processing of scheme B compared with single tap HST or DPS~~
  + Option 1: Yes
    - Option 1a: scheme A and scheme B with test applicability rule: If UE pass HST-SFN scheme A test cases, UE can skip HST-SFN scheme B test cases
    - Option 1b: scheme A and scheme B with test applicability rule: If UE supporting both HST SFN scheme A and B and supporting both 15kHz SCS and 30kHz SCS, then UE shall only pass schemeA 15kHz and schemeB 30kHz requirements.
  + Option 2: No
  + Option 3: do not introduce PDSCH requirements for SFN scheme B and define the following test applicability rule to guarantee performance with this scheme:
    - If UE passes the existing test cases (demodulation requirement for HST-SFN with high Doppler shift), the performance of SFN scheme B is guaranteed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We support option 1  As commented in 1st round we do see the obviously different compared with scheme A and B, in terms of UE feature list, receiver processing and channel model, QCL type information  Considering the test effort, the test applicability rule can be introduced for scheme A and B, i.e.,  If UE pass HST-SFN scheme A, UE can skip HST-SFN scheme B.  Regarding the option 3, as mentioned, scheme A/B do not need the advanced receiver compared with Rel-16 HST SFN pending on UE capability, the channel model and UE processing with different TCI state with QCI type information is different with Rel-16 HST SFN. UE support scheme B, while not support advanced receiver, the performance can be guaranteed. |
| CMCC | We support to define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme B to guarantee UE demodulation performance. As for the applicability rule between HST-SFN scheme A test cases and HST-SFN scheme B test cases, we are open to discussion. |
| Huawei | We support Option 1.  We prefer Option 1. For Rel-17 SFN scheme B, UE is configured with two set of delay-related parameters corresponding to different TCI state and one set of Doppler-related parameters corresponding to the reference TCI state. Considering different TRS configuration, different UE processing is expected comparing to the Rel-16 DPS.  For the applicability rule, we can consider similar method as Rel-17 HST to ensure test coverage and reduce the test effort at the same time, such as following:   * If UE supporting both HST SFN scheme A and B and supporting both 15kHz SCS and 30kHz SCS, then UE shall only pass schemeA 15kHz and schemeB 30kHz requirements.  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **UE is capable of** | **HST-SFN schemeA only** | **HST-SFN schemeB** **only** | **Both HST-SFN schemeA and schemeB** | | **15kHz only** | Case1: schemeA 15kHz | Case2: schemeB 15kHz | Case1: schemeA 15kHz  Case2: schemeB 15kHz | | **30kHz only** | Case3: schemeA 30kHz | Case4: schemeB 30kHz | Case3: schemeA 30kHz  Case4: schemeB 30kHz | | **Both 15kHz and 30kHz** | Case1: schemeA 15kHz  Case3: schemeA 30kHz | Case2: schemeB 15kHz  Case4: schemeB 30kHz | Case1: schemeA 15kHz  Case4: schemeB 30kHz | |
| Apple | We support option 2 – no requirements.  There is no enhanced receiver required for UE for SFN Scheme B. The UE should process this similar to single tap HST. The performance requirements should be for gNB to ensure correct pre-compensation is applied, rather than for UE. |
| Intel | We have several questions on test definition for SFN Scheme B. Please see our comments for issue 2-3-2. At current stage we do not see how we can define test that can differentiate conventional UE (that does not assume specific DL/UL QCL) and HST-SFN scheme B capable UE. Support Option 2 at this stage. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. Since PDSCH will be Doppler pre-compensated, our understanding is that it does not impact the UE demod processing in a meaningful way that requires defining requirements for this scheme. Furthermore, we think that after Doppler pre-compensation, channel seen by UE would be similar to a single tap channel, for which we already defined performance in Rel-16. |
| Ericsson | Given that the pre-compensation is only for the Doppler shift and not for the time difference between two RRHs, we are fine with option 1 to define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme B. |
| Mediatek | We support Option 2 with no requirements. We share similar views with comments from Apple and Qualcomm. |
| Samsung | To Qualcomm, Apple. Intel, and MTK  Even with Doppler pre-compensation, the path delay impact form RRH is still existing, UE need to track delay for each RRH based on two different TCI states, Different with single-tap, UE will use this two delay estimated from two TRSs for demodulation.  Based on commented with Qualcomm, it seem that we have same understanding that “the baseband processing for demodulation purpose could be different compared to single-tap and DPS channels for scheme A and scheme B”  As mentioned, scheme B is only applied for UE supported, For conventional UE, with single tap or DPS scheme, there is no need to handle the two path delay estimated for each RRH  While scheme B, based on RAN1 design two TCI states with variant A assumption as following  Variant A: One of the TCI state can be associated with {average delay, delay spread} and another TCI states can be associated with {average delay, delay spread, Doppler shift, Doppler spread} (i.e., QCL-TypeA)  Under this scheme, it’s assume Doppler shift already compensated in gNB side per TRP basis, the residual Doppler shift/spread should be same for two TRPs.  UE will use TRP based TRSs to track delay parameters in per RRH/TCI state manner  For single tap or DPS, both delay and frequency offset should be tracked for each RRH. |

**Issue 2-1-3: Whether to define PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scnearion**

*Tentative agreements*

* No PDSCH CA requirement for Enhancement on HST SFN scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI.

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* Confirm tentative agreement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We are ok the tentative agreement made in 1st round discussion |
| CMCC | OK with the tentative agreement |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement. |
| Intel | We support the tentative agreement. |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement |
| DoCoMo | OK with the tentative agreement |
| Ericsson | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Mediatek | OK with the tentative agreement. |

**Issue 2-2-1: Common setup for PDSCH requirement**

*Tentative agreements*

* Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline
  + PDCCH/PDSCH SFN transmitted from two RRHs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | |
| FDD 15 kHz SCS | TDD 30 kHz SCS |
| CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 | |
| DMRS type | Type 1 | |
| Number of DMRS symbols | 1+1+1 | |
| TDD pattern |  | 7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U |
| TRS configuration | 10ms, 2 slot pattern | |
| PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 | |
| Ds and Dmin | Ds =700m; Dmin=150m | |
| Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput | |

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* Confirm tentative agreement

**Issue 2-2-2: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung): TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately
  + Option 2 (Huawei, Apple): Configure 4 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#4k+i that i = 0, 1, 2, 3 and k = 0, 1, 2, … .
    - Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k and RRH#4k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1
    - Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+1 and RRH#4k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2
    - Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+2 and RRH#4k+3: TCI#2, TCI#3
    - Codepoint#3 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+3 and RRH#4(k+1): TCI#3, TCI#0
  + Option 3 (Ericsson, Samsung, Apple. Intel, Huawei,Qualcomm, MTK): Configure 3 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#3k+i that i = 0, 1, 2 and k = 0, 1, 2, … based on two RRHs
    - Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k and RRH#3k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1
    - Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k+2 and RRH#3k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2
    - Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k+2 and RRH#3k+2: TCI#2, TCI#0
* Recommended WF
  + Option 3



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We can go option 3, since only 2RRH considered in then channel model, it seems that 3 TCI code point is enough. |
| Huawei | We are OK with either Option 2 or Option3. |
| Apple | Either option 3 or option 2 works. We can go with option 3 since it would be sufficient for the test purpose. |
| Intel | We slightly prefer Option 3 that has smaller number of TCI states compared to Option 2. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3. We think that 3 TCI states is enough since UE would be receiving transmission from at most 2 RRHs simultaneously. |
| Ericsson | Share similar view with Samsung. 3 TCI code points should be enough. |
| Mediatek | We think Option 3 should be enough. |

**Issue 2-2-3: Maximum Doppler shift**

*Tentative agreements:*

* Define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme A with Maximum Doppler shift
  + 30KHz SCS: 1667Hz
  + 15 kHz SCS:
    - Option 1: 972 Hz
    - Option 2: 870 Hz
    - Companies are encouraged to bring simulation results with both option 1 and option 2 to check whether there is performance degradation with option 1, down selection one of them in the next meeting

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* Confirm tentative agreement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | In general, both option 1 and option 2 are within the capability of TRS Doppler tracking, option 2 is the same as Rel-16 HST-SFN with majority companies supported, we support option 2. We are open to further discuss  we can regard as baseline, and to check the simulation results with both option 1 and option2, if there is no obvious performance degradation, either option 1 and option 2 are fine for us, otherwise, option 2 is more preferable |
| CMCC | We are OK with the tentative agreement. If there is no performance degradation with option 1 based on the simulation results, option 1 is OK for us. |
| Huawei | We support Option 2. The maximum Doppler jump should be within the maximum UE capability for FOE based on TRS. |
| Apple | We should assume option 2 as baseline which is similar to HST-SFN. We need to further evaluate if higher max Doppler can be supported without performance degradation. Since this is different from single tap HST, we prefer lower max Doppler shift. |
| Intel | We support the tentative agreement to perform study next meeting and decide Doppler frequency for 15 kHz based on simulation results. |
| Qualcomm | We support 870 Hz for 15KHz SCS. (Is there a typo here? Could the proponent of this WF check whether it should be 870 Hz for option 2?)  Our understanding is that the difference between the estimated Dopplers for TRP#1 (i.e., estimated from TRS1) and TRP#2 (i.e., estimated from TRS2) should still be within the TRS pull-in range. Furthermore, UE has to come up with a mechanism to make use of the estimated Dopplers from two TRSs. Therefore, in our view, the assumption of single-tap model, for which a higher Doppler is assumed (option 2) is not applicable here. Hence, we also think it is not necessary to study 972 Hz Doppler model here. |
| DoCoMo | We are OK with the tentative agreement. (We also think that 840Hz is typo.) |
| SoftBank | We are fine with the tentative agreement. |
| Ericsson | Support the tentative agreement. |
| Mediatek | We are OK with the tentative agreement. |

**Issue 2-2-4: MCS and Rank**

*Tentative agreements:*

* Define PDSCH requirement with HST-SFN scheme A with MCS 17 and Rank 2 from MCS Table 1

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* Confirm tentative agreement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Ok with tentative agreement made in 1st round discussion |
| CMCC | OK with the tentative agreement |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement. |
| Intel | We support the tentative agreement. |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement |
| Ericsson | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Mediatek | OK with the tentative agreement. |

**Issue 2-2-5: Channel Model**

*Tentative agreements:*

* Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP as baseline
* For PDCCH and PDSCH HST-SFN with 2 nearest RRH, including time varying path power and path delay
  + Path power is normalized assuming only two visible TRPs.
* For TRS, single tap from each RRH, including time varying path power and path delay, apply the same scaling as PDSCH for each TRP for path power, and apply the same delay as PDSCH for each TRP for path delay, and apply the same time-varying Doppler shift from each RRH as PDCCH/PDSCH for Doppler shift

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* Confirm tentative agreement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Ok with tentative agreement made in 1st round discussion. Meanwhile, encourage companies to further check the wording whether there is anything missing |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement. |
| Intel | One clarification can be added as: total path power is normalized assuming only two visible TRPs. It is important to have the same SNR assumption as in Rel-16 HST-SFN. |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement |
| Ericsson | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Mediatek | OK with the tentative agreement. |

**Issue 2-2-6: Baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement**

* Proposals
  + ~~Option 1 (Ericsson): Confirm the assumption that the HST-SFN advanced receiver is the baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement~~
  + ~~Option 2(Qualcomm, Apple, Samsung): Do not assume HST-SFN advanced receiver is the baseline receiver for defining scheme A requirement~~
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | As mentioned in 1st round, the channel model and UE processing is different with HST-SFN and scheme A, meanwhile the UE feature is different with different UE capability, one is target as Rel-16, another is targeting as Rel-17, it is not proper to use the HST-SFN advanced receiver as the baseline receiver  We support option2, the legacy receiver to handle the Doppler tracking, similar as in single path or DPS scheme, can be considered |
| Huawei | We support Option 2. There is different UE processing is expected comparing to the Rel-16 HST-SFN. |
| Apple | We cannot agree to assume HST-SFN advance receiver as baseline receiver for HST SFN Scheme A, nor do we expect UE to support it without any advanced receiver. UE support of this would assume some advanced receiver indicated by UE capability of supporting this feature. |
| Intel | Similar view as Apple. |
| Qualcomm | Rel-17 HST-SFN Scheme A will require different processing at the UE side compared to that of Rel-16 HST-SFN. Therefore, our understanding is that Rel-16 HST-SFN advanced receiver can’t be assumed as a baseline for Rel-17 HST-SFN Scheme A. Therefore, we can’t support option 1.  On the other hand, option 2 seems to suggest that legacy receiver can be assumed, which we don’t agree with since the subsequent processing for demodulation purpose could be different compared to single-tap and DPS channels. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with option 2. Since RAN1 has introduced new UE capability for both HST-SFN Scheme A and Scheme B, we are ok to set the requirements for UE capable of HST-SFN Scheme A. |
| Mediatek | We support Option 2. |
| Samsung | Maybe there is no need to align the baseline receiver,  We can say the receive is up to UE implementation, the requirement is only applied the UE capable of HST-SFN scheme A ? |

**Issue 2-2-7: UE capabilty**

*Candidate options:*

* Option 1: The PDSCH demodulation requirements for HST-SFN Scheme A is applicable for UE capable of ‘SFN Scheme A’.

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* FFS: The PDSCH demodulation requirements for HST-SFN Scheme A is applicable for UE capable of ‘SFN Scheme A’.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Based on RAN1 agreement about UE feature list discussion in Rel-17 FeMIMO, scheme A is UE optional with capability signaling, we support option 1 |
| Apple | We believe RAN1 capability should be sufficient, but we can defer this to when RAN1 UE feature discussion is finalized. |
| Intel | Support Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to revisit this after RAN1 finalizes defining UE capability for Scheme A. |
| Ericsson | OK with the recommendation for 2nd round. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the recommendation for 2nd round. |

**Issue 2-2-8: Performance evalution**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Apple): Evaluate performance improvement of HST SFN scheme A over Rel-16 HST SFN.
* Recommended WF
  + Interested companies can provide the performance evaluation result of HST SNF scheme A over Rel-16 HST SFN. No impact on the Rel-17 HST SFN scheme A performance requirement definition.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Since RAN1 have already verified the benefit of scheme A compared with Rel-16 |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement. |
| Intel | We support the tentative agreement. |
| Ericsson | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the tentative agreement. |

**Issue 2-3-1: Common setup for PDSCH requirement**

*Candidate options:*

* Option 1: Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline
  + two TCI states with one configured QCL type A information, and another one configured QCL Type B information’
  + TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | |
| FDD 15 kHz SCS | TDD 30 kHz SCS |
| CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 | |
| DMRS type | Type 1 | |
| Number of DMRS symbols | 1+1+1 | |
| TDD pattern |  | 7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U |
| TRS configuration | 10ms, 2 slot pattern | |
| PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 | |
| Ds and Dmin | Ds =700m; Dmin=150m | |
| Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput | |

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* Option 1: Reuse existing Rel-16 HST-SFN test set-up as a baseline

~~two TCI states with one configured QCL type A information, and another one configured QCL Type B information’~~

* + ~~TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately~~

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value | |
| FDD 15 kHz SCS | TDD 30 kHz SCS |
| CBW | 10 MHz | 40 MHz |
| Antenna configuration | 2x2; 2x4 | |
| DMRS type | Type 1 | |
| Number of DMRS symbols | 1+1+1 | |
| TDD pattern |  | 7D1S2U, S: 6D 4G 4U |
| TRS configuration | 10ms, 2 slot pattern | |
| PDSCH mapping | Type A, Start symbol 2, Duration 12 | |
| Ds and Dmin | Ds =700m; Dmin=150m | |
| Test metric | SNR @70% of maximum throughput | |

`

**Issue 2-3-2: Modeling of TRP pre-compensation**

*Candidate options:*

* Option 1: For scheme B, BS behaviour can be Doppler Modeling into channel model so that TE implementation of pre-compensation has no impact on the UE performance during the test.
* Other options are not produced

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* ~~Pending on issue 2-1-2~~
* Option 1: For scheme B, BS behaviour can be Doppler Modeling into channel model so that TE implementation of pre-compensation has no impact on the UE performance during the test.
* Other options are not produced

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | In general, we are ok with option 1, For test, we prefer there is no Doppler modeling, only including the path delay and part power for each RRH  Even with residual Doppler shift, generated by TE due to the test uncertainty, my understanding the impact is minor |
| Huawei | We prefer to consider Doppler in the channel model. There may be maximum 0.4ppm residual frequency based on our calculation for the worst case. We think it is benefit to explicitly model the Doppler into channel model to verify whether UE can correctly handle it. |
| Intel | At current stage we do not understand completely how BS pre-compensation can be a part of channel model.  At the beginning of the test UE observes different Doppler shifts on each TRS. After what time period Doppler shifts will be aligned? Then due to UE movement there should be further misalignment of Doppler shifts and further adjustments of them in channel model. What is the time granularity of these processes and how UE behavior affect them?  Another question is how wrong UE can fail the test? In case there is no feedback between channel model change and UE processing (that should emulate SRS Tx with certain periodicity with QCL on reference TRP) it is not clear how UE can fail the test in case it has conventional UE Rx processing.  If we are going to define just two tap channel model with aligned Doppler shifts (even with some small difference due to frequency error of gNB Tx) there is no big difference from multi-path fading propagation conditions and conventional UE will also pass the test. |
| Ericsson | We prefer to consider the perfect pre-compensation as the reference.  On top of that we can discuss how to model the Doppler pre-compensation by the BS simulator. |
| Samsung | For scheme B, we agree that the accuracy of BS pre-compensation is up to BS implementation, even with BS pre-compensation, UE still need to track the Doppler frequency based on TRS, the residual Doppler shift/spread should be same for two TRPs, with one TCI state including Doppler shift information, while for path delay, UE still need to use TRP based TRS to track delay parameters in per RRH/TCI state manner.  For test setup, since the purpose is to verify the UE receiver with Doppler frequency tracking based on TRS associated with one TCI state, and delay spread estimation based on TRSs per TCI state, in our understanding, the Doppler shift misalignment due to the UE movement. |

**Issue 2-3-3: Number of TCI codepoint for Test**

*Candidate options:*

* Option 1: TCI state 1 and TCI state 2 applied for TRP/RRH #2n, #2n+1 separately; TRS 1 and TRS 2 transmitted from TRP#2n, and #2n+1 separately
* Option 2: Configure 4 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#4k+i that i = 0, 1, 2, 3 and k = 0, 1, 2, … .
  + Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k and RRH#4k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1
  + Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+1 and RRH#4k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2
  + Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+2 and RRH#4k+3: TCI#2, TCI#3
  + Codepoint#3 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#4k+3 and RRH#4(k+1): TCI#3, TCI#0
* Option 3: Configure 3 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#3k+i that i = 0, 1, 2 and k = 0, 1, 2, … based on two RRHs
  + Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k and RRH#3k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1
  + Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k+1 and RRH#3k+2: TCI#1, TCI#2
  + Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k+2 and RRH#3(k+1): TCI#2, TCI#0

*Recommendations for 2nd round:*

* Option 3: Configure 3 TCI code point during test, transmit TRS#i from RRH#3k+i that i = 0, 1, 2 and k = 0, 1, 2, … based on two RRHs
  + Codepoint#0 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k and RRH#3k+1 : TCI#0, TCI#1
  + Codepoint#1 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k+1 and RRH#3(k+1), TCI#2, TCI#0
  + Codepoint#2 active when UE receiving PDSCH from RRH#3k+2 and RRH#3(k+1): TCI#2, TCI#0

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | As mentioned issue 2-2-2, we can go option 3 with configure 3 TCI code point during the test. |
| Huawei | We are OK with either Option 2 or Option3. |
| Ericsson | Support option 3, same as scheme A. |

**Issue 2-3-4: MCS and Rank**

* MCS 17 with Rank 2 as a baseline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | We support option 1 as baseline |
| Ericsson | OK with option 1 for the initial evaluation. |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-3-5: Channel Model**

* Reusing the existing Rel-16 HST-SFN channel model (Ds=700m, Dmin=150m) with removing the two furthest paths corresponding to the two furthest TRP as baseline
* For PDCCH and PDSCH HST-SFN with 2 nearest RRH, including time varying path power and path delay, without modelling Doppler shift
  + Path power is normalized assuming only two visible TRPs.
* For TRS, single tap from each RRH, including time varying path power and path delay, apply the same scaling as PDSCH for each TRP for path power, and apply the same delay as PDSCH for each TRP for path delay, FFS modelling Doppler shift

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | As commented in previous, we support to define requirement with scheme B.  If it can be agreed, channel model recommended is preferred |
| Huawei | Similar view as Issue 2-3-2. |
| Ericsson | OK with the recommendation for 2nd round. |

# Topic #3: CSI reporting requirement for multi-TRP

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2203779 | Apple | **CSI Enhancements for multi-TRP**  Proposal 1: Introduce PMI reporting requirements for single DCI SDM transmission scheme.  Proposal 2: Introduce PMI reporting requirements for CSI enhancements for Mode 1 with X=0.  Proposal 3: Evaluate performance of PMI reporting with enhanced CSI reporting against single PMI reporting for multi-TRP transmission.  Proposal 4: Use the following simulation assumptions as baseline:   * FR: FR1 only * Antenna config: 8x2, 8x4 * Number of layers: 2 (1 MIMO layer per TRP) * NZP CSI-RS resource set with 2 resources: Ks=2   + K1=1; For NZP CSI-RS resource associated with TRP1   + K2=1; For NZP CSI-RS resource associated with TRP2 * CMR pair: N=1 for mTRP hypothesis * CSI Report Mode: Mode 1 with X=0   Proposal 5: Introduce test metric of TP ratio of multi-TRP follow PMI and random PMI. The layers for random PMI per TRP should be orthogonal.  Proposal 6: Do not introduce requirements for CSI reporting for multi-DCI multi-TRP transmission scheme. |
| R4-2204784 | Samsung | Proposal 1: Introduce below test cases for CSI enhancement on NCJT m-TRP transmission schemes   * Test 1a: PMI test for single-DCI based on M-TRP scheme with full overlapped resource allocation * Test 1b: CQI test for multi-DCI based on M-TRP scheme with non-overlapping resource allocation   Proposal 2: General test set-up for CSI reporting   * 2 TPs configured * One CSI-RS resource set with Ks = 2   + TP1 associated with NZP-CSI-RS resource 1   + TP2 associated with NZP CSI-RS resource 2 * CSI reporting: One CSI associated with multi-TRP measurement hypothesis and X=0 CSI associated with single-TRP measurement hypothesis (CSI reporting mode 1 with X=0)   + CMR group 1 {CMR a} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 1, K1=1   + CMR group 2 {CMR b} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 2, K2=1   + CMR pair (N=1) : CMR {a,b} for M-TRP measurement hypothesis * No time/frequency offset between two TPs   Proposal 3: Using 4+ 4 ports for PMI test for M-TRP transmission scheme. |
| R4-2205429 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Introduce requirements for PMI reporting for single-DCI based multi-TRP scheme.  Proposal 2: Not to introduce requirement for CQI and RI reporting for single-DCI based multi-TRP scheme.  Proposal 3: Not to introduce CSI reporting requirement for multi-DCI based multi-TRP scheme. |
| R4-2205438 | Nokia | Observation 1: For multi-DCI cases with non-overlapping PDSCH resources, the PMI/RI calculations for each TRP are not different from legacy. CQI on the other hand is shared among TRPs, so the legacy algorithm does no longer apply.  Observation 2: For single-DCI cases with overlapping PDSCH resources, the PMI/RI/CQI calculations differ significantly from legacy.  Proposal 1: Single-DCI: Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI, RI and PMI reporting for Single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme, with the PMI reporting being the most important one.  Proposal 2: Multi-DCI: Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI reporting for Multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme. |
| R4-2205776 | Huawei | Proposal 1: Only define PMI reporting cases for single-DCI based multi-TRP scheme.  Proposal 2: Configure two resources in a resource pair in the same slot for CSI reporting requirements for mTRP.  Proposal 3: Only consider the first reporting method with X=0 for CSI reporting requirement. Number of antenna port, reporting granularity(WB/SB), CSI-RS resource type (P/AP), CSI-RS reporting type (P/AP), test metric, etc. can be reused from the existing CSI reporting cases, i.e. configuration of 4+4/8+8/16+16 port case is corresponding to that of the existing 8/16/32 port case.  Proposal 4: Reuse from the Rel-15/16 CSI reporting requirements, i.e. 1 layer per TRP.  Proposal 5: Do not consider time/frequency offset between two TRPs.  Proposal 6: Select 4 ports per TRP as starting point for CSI reporting requirements for mTRP. |
| R4-2206108 | Qualcomm | Proposal 1: The propagation channels apply to each of TRP #1 and TRP #2 is TDLA30-5 and are statistically independent.  Proposal 2: Correlation matrix and antenna configuration parameters apply to each of TRP #1 and TRP #2 is high corr and cross-polarized, respectively.  Proposal 3: The same Pc ratios to be considered for TRP #1 and TRP #2 in defining requirements.  Proposal 4: The SNRs for TRP #1 and TRP #2 are assumed to be balanced with a scaling factor of 1/sqrt(2) for the transmitted signal from each TRP.  Proposal 5: Only PMI reporting is considered for defining the requirements for the m-TRP CSI.  Proposal 6: The performance requirement for the m-TRP PMI reporting should not consider single TRP reporting and be defined only within the context of m-TRP reporting.  Proposal 7: The simulation assumption for m-TRP PMI reporting should Wideband PMI reporting for report Option 1 with X=0.  Proposal 8: The number of CSI-RS ports is assumed to be 8 for each TRP for the PMI tests.  Proposal 9: The m-TRP CSI requirements be limited to FR1 and do not define requirements for FR2. |

## Open issues summary

Last RAN4 meeting agreeements in the WF R4-2203090/91/92

List of open issues

* Sub-topic 3-1 Test Scope
  + Issue 3-1-1: Test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP transmission
* Sub-topic 3-2: Test setup for CSI reporting requirement for m-TRP transmission
  + Issue 3-2-1: Common simulation assumption
  + Issue 3-2-2: General test set-up for CSI reporting
  + Issue 3-2-3: CSI resource configuration
  + Issue 3-2-4: Number of CSI-RS Ports
  + Issue 3-2-5: Number of layers
  + Issue 3-2-6: Test metric for PMI reporting
  + Issue 3-2-7: Performance evaluation

### Sub-topic 3-1: Test Scope

**Issue 3-1-1: Test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP transmission**

* Observations
  + Observation 1(Nokia):
    - For multi-DCI cases with non-overlapping PDSCH resources, the PMI/RI calculations for each TRP are not different from legacy. CQI on the other hand is shared among TRPs, so the legacy algorithm does no longer apply
    - For single-DCI cases with overlapping PDSCH resources, the PMI/RI/CQI calculations differ significantly from legacy.
* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung, Nokia): Introduce below test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP
    - Test 1a: PMI test for single-DCI based on M-TRP scheme with full overlapped resource allocation
    - Test 1b : CQI test for multi-DCI based on M-TRP scheme with non-overlapping resource allocation
  + Option 2(Huawei, Apple, Qualcomm): Only define PMI reporting cases for single-DCI based on multi-TRP
    - Option 2a (Qualcomm, Apple): The m-TRP CSI requirements be limited to FR1 and do not define requirements for FR2.
  + Option 3(Nokia):
    - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI, RI and PMI reporting for Single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme, with the PMI reporting being the most important one.
    - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI reporting for Multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme.
  + Option 4(Ericsson)
    - Introduce requirements for PMI reporting for single-DCI based multi-TRP scheme.
    - Not to introduce requirement for CQI and RI reporting for single-DCI based multi-TRP scheme.
    - Not to introduce CSI reporting requirement for multi-DCI based multi-TRP scheme
* Recommended WF
  + Define PMI reporting requirement for single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme with full overlapped resource allocation only in FR1
  + FFS on CQI reporting requirement for multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme
    - Option 1(Samsung, Nokia): Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI reporting for Multi-DCI based Multi TRP scheme
    - Option 2(Apple, Huawei, Qualcomm, Ericsson): No to define CQI reporting requirement

### Sub-topic 3-2: Test setup for CSI reporting requirement for m-TRP transmission

**Issue 3-2-1: Common simulation assumption**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Qualcomm)
    - Channel and correlation models: TDLA30-10 with XP High with statistically independent for each TRP
    - Pc setting: Same Pc ratios for each TRP in defining requirement
    - SNR setting: The SNRs for TRP #1 and TRP #2 are assumed to be balanced with a scaling factor of 1/sqrt(2) for the transmitted signal from each TRP
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 3-2-2: General test set-up for CSI reporting**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung)
    - 2 TPs configured with fully overlapping resource allocation
    - One CSI-RS resource with Ks = 2
* TP1 associated with NZP-CSI-RS resource 1
* TP2 associated with NZP CSI-RS resource 2
  + - CSI reporting: One CSI associated with multi-TRP measurement hypothesis and X=0 CSI associated with single-TRP measurement hypothesis (CSI reporting mode 1 with X=0)
* CMR group 1 {CMR a} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 1, K1=1
* CMR group 2 {CMR b} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 2, K2=1
* CMR pair (N=1) : CMR {a,b} for M-TRP measurement hypothesis
  + - Fix layer combination and precoding during test cases i.e. 1+1 for 2Rx, 2+2 for 4Rx
    - No time/frequency offset between two TP
    - Other test parameters reusing existing Rel-16 PDSCH requirements with single-DCI M-TRP SDM scheme
  + Option 2(Huawei)
    - Configure two resources in a resource pair in the same slot for CSI reporting requirements for mTRP.
    - Number of antenna port, reporting granularity(WB/SB), CSI-RS resource type (P/AP), CSI-RS reporting type (P/AP), test metric, etc. can be reused from the existing CSI reporting cases, i.e. configuration of 4+4/8+8/16+16 port case is corresponding to that of the existing 8/16/32 port case.
    - Reuse from the Rel-15/16 CSI reporting requirements, i.e. 1 layer per TRP.
    - No time/frequency offset between two TP
  + Option 3(Qualcomm)
    - CSI reporting type: WB PMI reporting for mode 1 with X=0
  + Option 4(Apple )
    - FR: FR1 only
    - Antenna config: 8x2, 8x4
    - Number of layers: 2 (1 MIMO layer per TRP)
    - NZP CSI-RS resource set with 2 resources: Ks=2
* K1=1; For NZP CSI-RS resource associated with TRP1
* K2=1; For NZP CSI-RS resource associated with TRP2
  + - CMR pair: N=1 for mTRP hypothesis
    - CSI Report Mode: Mode 1 with X=0
* Recommended WF
  + 2 TPs configured with fully overlapping resource allocation
  + One CSI-RS resource with Ks = 2
    - TP1 associated with NZP-CSI-RS resource 1
    - TP2 associated with NZP CSI-RS resource 2
  + CSI reporting: One CSI associated with multi-TRP measurement hypothesis and X=0 CSI associated with single-TRP measurement hypothesis (CSI reporting mode 1 with X=0)
    - CMR group 1 {CMR a} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 1, K1=1
    - CMR group 2 {CMR b} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 2, K2=1
    - CMR pair (N=1) : CMR {a,b} for M-TRP measurement hypothesis
  + No time/frequency offset between two TP

**Issue 3-2-3: CSI resource configuration**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Huawei): Configure two resources in a resource pair in the same slot for CSI reporting requirements for mTRP.
* Recommended WF
  + Option 1

**Issue 3-2-4: Number of CSI-RS Ports**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Qualcomm):
    - 8 for each TRP
  + Option 2 (Samsung, Apple, Huawei):
    - 4 for each TRP
* Recommended WF
  + Option 2

**Issue 3-2-5: Number of layers**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Apple, Huawei): 2 (1 MIMO layer per TRP)
  + Option 2 (Samsung): 1MIMO layer for each TRP with 2Rx, 2 MIMO layers for each TRP with 4Rx
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

**Issue 3-2-6: Test metric for PMI reporting**

* Proposals
  + Option 1
    - Option 1a (Apple): TP ratio of multi-TRP follow PMI and random PMI. The layers for random PMI per TRP should be orthogonal
    - Option 1b (Qualcomm): The performance requirement for the m-TRP PMI reporting should not consider single TRP reporting and be defined only within the context of m-TRP reporting.
* Recommended WF
  + Apply test metric of TP ratio follow PMI and random PMI with m-TRP reporting. The layer for random PMI per TRP should be orthogonal

**Issue 3-2-7: Performance evaluation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Apple): Evaluate performance of PMI reporting with enhanced CSI reporting against single PMI reporting for multi-TRP transmission.
* Recommended WF
  + Please proponents of proposal clarify the intension of performance evaluation

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*One of the two formats, i.e. either example 1 or 2 can be used by moderators.*

Sub topic 3-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 3-1-1 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 3-1-1  Single-DCI:  Nokia would prefer CQI, RI and PMI, but can compromise on defining new CSI reporting requirement for PMI only for the single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme.  Multi-DCI:  For multi-DCI cases with non-overlapping PDSCH resources, the PMI/RI calculations for each TRP are not different from legacy. CQI on the other hand is shared among TRPs, so the legacy algorithm does no longer apply. Therefore, Nokia still prefer CQI reporting if feasible from a work plan perspective |
| Intel | Issue 3-1-1  For multi-TRP Tx scheme RAN1 has designed enhanced CSI feedback that assumes reporting of single CQI, and two PMI and RI values. For single-DCI based Tx scheme, considering reception of overlapped MIMO layers from two different TRPs, calculation of CQI, PMI and RI values are different compared to a single-TRP Tx scenario. Therefore, we see a necessity to define CQI, PMI and RI reporting requirements for single-DCI based Tx scheme.  The same enhanced CSI feedback mechanism is applied for multi-DCI based Tx scheme. For non-overlapped configuration only CQI calculation is different compared to the single-TRP scenario since UE should report single CQI value. Therefore, we recommend also defining requirements for CQI reporting for multi-DCI non-overlapped Tx scheme. Otherwise, system performance cannot be guaranteed for multi-DCI Tx scheme. |
| Apple | **Issue 3-1-1: Test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP transmission**  Single DCI SDM – PMI reporting only  Multi-DCI transmission – Do not define CQI reporting requirements. Since there are no CSI enhancements for multi-DCI transmission, we don’t see the need to define such requirements. The NW can always configure different NZP CSI-RS from different TRP and UE reports. Its up to the gNB how the CSI reports are used. Also, how is CQI/CSI reporting different in case NZP CSI-RS are from different TRP or multiple NZP CSI-RS from same TRP. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 3-1-1: Test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP transmission**  Single DCI: Only PMI reporting for SDM transmission  Multi-DCI: We support Option 2  From CQI/CSI processing point of view, we are of the opinion that multi-DCI processing is not different compared to that of single DCI transmission. Hence, we don’t see a need to define such requirement. Also, our understanding is that multi-DCI is not part of the FeMIMO WID for “Enhancement on CSI measurement and reporting” (item 4). |
| Ericsson | **Issue 3-1-1: Test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP transmission**  For single DCI: UE will benefit the most from PMI reporting of m-TRP enhancement on CSI. Considering the workload and limited timeslot, we support only define PMI reporting requirement.  For multi-DCI: PMI and RI reporting are the same with legacy processing. CQI reporting is different but with no enhanced algorithm. We don’t support define CSI reporting requirement for multi-DCI transmission. |
| Mediatek | **Issue 3-1-1: Test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP transmission**  We support recommended WF to define PMI reporting requirement for single-DCI. Furthermore, we support Option 2 in recommended WF not to define requirement for multi-DCI. |
| Huawei | **Issue 3-1-1: Test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP transmission**  We prefer to only define PMI reporting for single DCI SDM scheme. Based on RAN 1 design, only Rel-16 single-DCI based multi-TRP scheme (scheme 1a) is enhanced. |

Sub topic 3-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 3-2-1  Issue 3-2-2  Issue 3-2-3  Issue 3-2-4  Issue 3-2-5  Issue 3-2-6  Issue 3-2-7 |
| Apple | **Issue 3-2-5: Number of layers**  Option 1. We don’t see the need to introduce 4 layers for 4RX. 2 layers in total is sufficient. Also we try to use the same test setup and simulation assumptions for 2RX and 4RX.  **Issue 3-2-7: Performance evaluation**  Our intention is to evaluate the performance of enhanced CSI processing for mTRP against PMI reports for multi-TRP with different resources configured from each TRP. For enhanced CSI the UE needs advanced processing. With multiple reports the gNB needs to combine appropriately. It would be worth evaluating if enhanced receiver processing is indeed beneficial. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 3-2-1: Common simulation assumption**  We support the recommended WF  **Issue 3-2-2: General test set-up for CSI reporting**  Could proponent of the WF consider pulling Option 3 into the recommended WF? Then we could support the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-2-3: CSI resource configuration**  We support the recommended WF  **Issue 3-2-4: Number of CSI-RS Ports**  We support option 1. We think precoding gain could be minimal with only 4-port for PMI reporting. Therefore, we suggest going with 8-port configuration as a starting point.  **Issue 3-2-5: Number of layers**  We support Option 1 |
| Huawei | **Issue 3-2-1: Common simulation assumption**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-2-2: General test set-up for CSI reporting**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-2-3: CSI resource configuration**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-2-4: Number of CSI-RS Ports**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-2-5: Number of layers**  We prefer Option 1. We think it is sufficient to only consider 2 layers requirements. Also we propose to align with the legacy PMI testing that there is also no 4 layers cases defined.  **Issue 3-2-6: Test metric for PMI reporting**  OK with the recommended WF.  **Issue 3-2-7: Performance evaluation**  The purpose of this test cases is to verify correct UE behavior under multi-TRP hypothesis. We don’t think it necessity to do evaluations to find the gain for the enhanced CSI reporting comparing to the single-TRP hypothesis for multi-TRP scenario. |
| Samsung | Issue 3-2-1  We are ok with option 1 as start point  Issue 3-2-2  We are ok with recommended WF  Issue 3-2-3  Ok with option 1  Issue 3-2-4  Prefer option 2, in my understanding 4 port for each TRP can meet the test purpose  Issue 3-2-5  We can go with option1 as compromise  Issue 3-2-6  Ok with recommended WF  Issue 3-2-7  In my understanding, the performance gain has already verified in RAN1, From demodulation requirement aspect, we just define requirement with proper test setup to verify the UE proper receiver based on RAN1 feature.  May be we can say, “interesting companies can provide the performance comparison of PMI reporting with enhanced CSI reporting against single PMI reporting for multi-TRP transmission ” |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic 3-1** | **Issue 3-1-1: Test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP transmission**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Samsung, Nokia)): Introduce below test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP     - Test 1a (Nokia compromised): PMI test for single-DCI based on M-TRP scheme with full overlapped resource allocation     - Test 1b: CQI test for multi-DCI based on M-TRP scheme with non-overlapping resource allocation   + Option 2(Huawei, Apple, Qualcomm, Ericsson, MTK): Only define PMI reporting cases for single-DCI based on multi-TRP     - Option 2a (Qualcomm, Apple): The m-TRP CSI requirements be limited to FR1 and do not define requirements for FR2.   + Option 3(Nokia):     - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI, RI and PMI reporting for Single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme, with the PMI reporting being the most important one.     - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI reporting for Multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme.   + Option 4(Intel)     - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI, RI and PMI reporting for Single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme     - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI reporting for Multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme.   *Tentative agreements:*   * Define PMI reporting requirement for single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme with full overlapped resource allocation (SDM) only in FR1   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * FFS on additional CSI reporting requirement for single/multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme   + Option 1     - Option 1a(Samsung, Nokia): Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI reporting for Multi-DCI based Multi TRP scheme     - Option 1b (Nokia, Intel): Define RI, CQI reporting requirement for single-DCI based Multi-TRP, and define CQI reporting requirement for multi-DCI   + Option 2(Apple, Huawei, Qualcomm, Ericsson, MTK): Not define RI, CQI reporting requirement for single-DCI, Not define CQI reporting requirement for multi-DCI |
| **Sub-topic 3-2** | **Issue 3-2-1: Common simulation assumption**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Qualcomm, Huawei, Samsung )     - Channel and correlation models: TDLA30-10 with XP High with statistically independent for each TRP     - Pc setting: Same Pc ratios for each TRP in defining requirement     - SNR setting: The SNRs for TRP #1 and TRP #2 are assumed to be balanced with a scaling factor of 1/sqrt(2) for the transmitted signal from each TRP   *Tentative agreements:*   * Channel and correlation models: TDLA30-10 with XP High with statistically independent for each TRP * Pc setting: Same Pc ratios for each TRP in defining requirement * SNR setting: The SNRs for TRP #1 and TRP #2 are assumed to be balanced with a scaling factor of 1/sqrt(2) for the transmitted signal from each TRP   **Issue 3-2-2: General test set-up for CSI reporting**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Samsung)     - 2 TPs configured with fully overlapping resource allocation     - One CSI-RS resource with Ks = 2 * TP1 associated with NZP-CSI-RS resource 1 * TP2 associated with NZP CSI-RS resource 2   + - CSI reporting: One CSI associated with multi-TRP measurement hypothesis and X=0 CSI associated with single-TRP measurement hypothesis (CSI reporting mode 1 with X=0) * CMR group 1 {CMR a} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 1, K1=1 * CMR group 2 {CMR b} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 2, K2=1 * CMR pair (N=1) : CMR {a,b} for M-TRP measurement hypothesis   + - Fix layer combination and precoding during test cases i.e. 1+1 for 2Rx, 2+2 for 4Rx     - No time/frequency offset between two TP     - Other test parameters reusing existing Rel-16 PDSCH requirements with single-DCI M-TRP SDM scheme   + Option 2(Huawei)     - Configure two resources in a resource pair in the same slot for CSI reporting requirements for mTRP.     - Number of antenna port, reporting granularity(WB/SB), CSI-RS resource type (P/AP), CSI-RS reporting type (P/AP), test metric, etc. can be reused from the existing CSI reporting cases, i.e. configuration of 4+4/8+8/16+16 port case is corresponding to that of the existing 8/16/32 port case.     - Reuse from the Rel-15/16 CSI reporting requirements, i.e. 1 layer per TRP.     - No time/frequency offset between two TP   + Option 3(Qualcomm)     - CSI reporting type: WB PMI reporting for mode 1 with X=0   + Option 4(Apple)     - FR: FR1 only     - Antenna config: 8x2, 8x4     - Number of layers: 2 (1 MIMO layer per TRP)     - NZP CSI-RS resource set with 2 resources: Ks=2 * K1=1; For NZP CSI-RS resource associated with TRP1 * K2=1; For NZP CSI-RS resource associated with TRP2   + - CMR pair: N=1 for mTRP hypothesis     - CSI Report Mode: Mode 1 with X=0   *Tentative agreements:*   * 2 TPs configured with fully overlapping resource allocation * One CSI-RS resource with Ks = 2   + TP1 associated with NZP-CSI-RS resource 1   + TP2 associated with NZP CSI-RS resource 2 * CSI reporting: One CSI associated with multi-TRP measurement hypothesis and X=0 CSI associated with single-TRP measurement hypothesis (CSI reporting mode 1 with X=0)   + CMR group 1 {CMR a} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 1, K1=1   + CMR group 2 {CMR b} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 2, K2=1   + CMR pair (N=1) : CMR {a,b} for M-TRP measurement hypothesis * No time/frequency offset between two TPs * WB PMI reporting for mode 1 with X=0   **Issue 3-2-3: CSI resource configuration**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Huawei, Qualcomm): Configure two resources in a resource pair in the same slot for CSI reporting requirements for mTRP.   *Tentative agreements:*   * Configure two resources in a resource pair in the same slot for CSI reporting requirements for mTRP.   **Issue 3-2-4: Number of CSI-RS Ports**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Qualcomm):     - 8 for each TRP   + Option 2 (Samsung, Apple, Huawei):     - 4 for each TRP   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Encourage companies to check whether option 2 is acceptable based on Majority view?   **Issue 3-2-5: Number of layers**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Apple, Huawei, Qualcomm, Samsung(compromised)): 2 (1 MIMO layer per TRP)   + Option 2 (Samsung): 1MIMO layer for each TRP with 2Rx, 2 MIMO layers for each TRP with 4Rx   *Tentative agreements:*   * Number of layers: 2 (1MIMO layer per TRP)   **Issue 3-2-6: Test metric for PMI reporting**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1     - Option 1a (Apple, Huawei): TP ratio of multi-TRP follow PMI and random PMI. The layers for random PMI per TRP should be orthogonal     - Option 1b (Qualcomm): The performance requirement for the m-TRP PMI reporting should not consider single TRP reporting and be defined only within the context of m-TRP reporting.   *Tentative agreements:*   * Apply test metric of TP ratio follow PMI and random PMI with m-TRP reporting. The layer for random PMI per TRP should be orthogonal   **Issue 3-2-7: Performance evaluation**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Apple): Evaluate performance of PMI reporting with enhanced CSI reporting against single PMI reporting for multi-TRP transmission.   + Option 2 (Huawei, Samsung): there is no necessary to do evaluations to find the gain for the enhanced CSI reporting comparing to the single-TRP hypothesis for multi-TRP scenario.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Interested companies can provide the performance evaluation of PMI reporting with enhanced CSI reporting against single PMI reporting for multi-TRP transmission. No impact on the PMI reporting requirement definition for single-DCI based Multi-TRP. |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

**Issue 3-1-1: Test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP transmission**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Samsung, Nokia)): Introduce below test cases for CSI reporting enhancement for m-TRP
    - Test 1a (Nokia compromised): PMI test for single-DCI based on M-TRP scheme with full overlapped resource allocation
    - Test 1b: CQI test for multi-DCI based on M-TRP scheme with non-overlapping resource allocation
  + Option 2(Huawei, Apple, Qualcomm, Ericsson, MTK): Only define PMI reporting cases for single-DCI based on multi-TRP
    - Option 2a (Qualcomm, Apple): The m-TRP CSI requirements be limited to FR1 and do not define requirements for FR2.
  + Option 3(Nokia):
    - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI, RI and PMI reporting for Single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme, with the PMI reporting being the most important one.
    - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI reporting for Multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme.
  + Option 4(Intel)
    - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI, RI and PMI reporting for Single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme
    - Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI reporting for Multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme.
* Recommended WF
  + FFS on additional CSI reporting requirement for single/multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme
    - Option 1
      * Option 1a(Samsung, Nokia): Define new CSI reporting requirement for CQI reporting for Multi-DCI based Multi TRP scheme
      * Option 1b (Nokia, Intel): Define RI, CQI reporting requirement for single-DCI based Multi-TRP, and define CQI reporting requirement for multi-DCI
    - Option 2(Apple, Huawei, Qualcomm, Ericsson, MTK): Not define RI, CQI reporting requirement for single-DCI, Not define CQI reporting requirement for multi-DCI
    - Option 3 (Nokia): it time allows define CQI reporting requirement in case of Multi-DCI

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement and Option 2 for additional CSI reporting requirements. |
| Qualcomm | We support the tentative agreement and Option 2 for the CSI reporting requirement. |
| Ericsson | We don’t support introducing additional CSI reporting requirement for single/multi-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme. Only define PMI reporting requirement for single-DCI based transmission and no CSI requirement for multi-DCI based transmission. |
| Mediatek | We still support Option 2. |
| Huawei | We prefer Option 2. |
| Nokia | Single-DCI:  Nokia would prefer CQI, RI and PMI, but can compromise on defining new CSI reporting requirement for PMI only for the single-DCI based Multi-TRP scheme.  Multi-DCI:  For multi-DCI cases with non-overlapping PDSCH resources, the PMI/RI calculations for each TRP are not different from legacy. CQI on the other hand is shared among TRPs, so the legacy algorithm does no longer apply. Therefore, Nokia still prefer CQI reporting if feasible from a work plan perspective  Therefor we suggest:  Option 3: Define PMI reporting requirements in case of Single-DCI  If time allows define CQI reporting requirements in case of multi-DCI |

**Issue 3-2-1: Common simulation assumption**

Tentative agreements:

* Channel and correlation models: TDLA30-10 with XP High with statistically independent for each TRP
* Pc setting: Same Pc ratios for each TRP in defining requirement
* SNR setting: The SNRs for TRP #1 and TRP #2 are assumed to be balanced with a scaling factor of 1/sqrt(2) for the transmitted signal from each TRP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement |
| Ericsson | Fine with the tentative agreement |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the tentative agreement. |
| Huawei | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Nokia | We are fine with the tentative agreement |

**Issue 3-2-2: General test set-up for CSI reporting**

Tentative agreements:

* 2 TPs configured with fully overlapping resource allocation
* One CSI-RS resource with Ks = 2
  + TP1 associated with NZP-CSI-RS resource 1
  + TP2 associated with NZP CSI-RS resource 2
* CSI reporting: One CSI associated with multi-TRP measurement hypothesis and X=0 CSI associated with single-TRP measurement hypothesis (CSI reporting mode 1 with X=0)
  + CMR group 1 {CMR a} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 1, K1=1
  + CMR group 2 {CMR b} corresponding to NZP CSI-RS resource 2, K2=1
  + CMR pair (N=1) : CMR {a,b} for M-TRP measurement hypothesis
* No time/frequency offset between two TPs
* WB PMI reporting for mode 1 with X=0
* RAN4 apply the above test setup as baseline for CSI reporting requirement definition

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement |
| Ericsson | Ok to be the baseline. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the tentative agreement. |
| Huawei | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Nokia | We are fine with the tentative agreement |

**Issue 3-2-3: CSI resource configuration**

Tentative agreements:

* Configure two resources in a resource pair in the same slot for CSI reporting requirements for mTRP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement |
| Ericsson | Fine with tentative agreement. Same assumption as fully overlapping resource. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the tentative agreement. |
| Huawei | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Nokia | We are fine with the tentative agreement |

**Issue 3-2-4: Number of CSI-RS Ports**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Qualcomm):
    - 8 for each TRP
  + Option 2 (Samsung, Apple, Huawei, Qualcomm (compromise), MTK, Nokia):
    - 4 for each TRP
* Recommended WF
  + ~~Encourage companies to check whether option 2 is acceptable based on Majority view?~~
  + Companies are encouraged to provide the simulation result in the next meeting with both option 1 and option 2 base on agreed simulation assumption to check the performance gain with the test metric, i.e. throughput ratio with a given SNR test. Make the decision about number of CSI-RS ports in next meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 2 is acceptable. |
| Qualcomm | We think it could be difficult to define requirement with 4-port CSI-RS since the precoding gain could be minimal. However, we are okay to compromise on this and support Option 2 as a starting point, but would like to keep it open pending simulation results. |
| Ericsson | We support to decide it in the next meeting based on the simulation results, e.g. throughput ratio with a given SNR test point. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the Option 2. However, we are fine to postpone final decision until simulation results are available. |
| Huawei | We prefer Option 2. |
| Nokia | We support option 2 as a starting point. |

**Issue 3-2-5: Number of layers**

Tentative agreements:

* Number of layers: 2 (1MIMO layer per TRP)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement |
| Ericsson | Support the tentative agreements. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the tentative agreement. |
| Huawei | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Nokia | We are fine with the tentative agreement |

**Issue 3-2-6: Test metric for PMI reporting**

Tentative agreements:

* Apply test metric of TP ratio follow PMI and random PMI with m-TRP reporting. The layer for random PMI per TRP should be orthogonal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We support the tentative agreement |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the tentative agreement |
| Ericsson | Support the tentative agreements. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the tentative agreements. |
| Huawei | OK with the tentative agreement. |
| Nokia | We are fine with the tentative agreement |

**Issue 3-2-7: Performance evaluation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Apple): Evaluate performance of PMI reporting with enhanced CSI reporting against single PMI reporting for multi-TRP transmission.
  + Option 2 (Huawei, Samsung): there is no necessary to do evaluations to find the gain for the enhanced CSI reporting comparing to the single-TRP hypothesis for multi-TRP scenario.
* Recommended WF
  + Interested companies can provide the performance evaluation of PMI reporting with enhanced CSI reporting against single PMI reporting for multi-TRP transmission. No impact on the PMI reporting requirement definition for single-DCI based Multi-TRP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We support the recommended WF. |
| Ericsson | Support the recommended WF. |
| Mediatek | We support the recommended WF. |
| Huawei | OK with the recommended WF. |

**Issue 3-2-8: Codebook**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Reusing the existing Rel-15 PMI requirement setup: i.e, type I single panel
* Recommended WF
  + Reusing the existing Rel-15 PMI requirement setup: i.e, type I single panel for PMI reporting requirement for single-DCI based Multi-TRP



# Topic #4: PMI reporting requirement for Rel-17 enhanced Type II PS codebook

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2204784 | Samsung | Proposal 4: Introduce PMI test case for enhanced Type II PS codebook under SU-MIMO set-up  Proposal 5: For BF CSI-RS, two methods can be considered:   * Alt 1: MIMO fading channel as Rel-13 LTE Class B K=1 PMI test cases * Alt 2: Power scaling method similar as Rel-13 LTE Class B K>1 CRI test case |
| R4-2204829 | Nokia | Requirements:  Observation 1: The Rel-17 feTypeIIPS codebook is (for the UE) a lower complexity version of Rel-16 eTypeIIPS style of codebooks, which can be equally well applied to both MU and SU MIMO scenarios.  Observation 2: The Rel-17 further enhanced type II port selection codebook is structurally, computationally, and implementation wise, very distinct from the Rel-16 PS codebook and requirements do not exist for any codebooks with comparable structure.  Proposal 1: Define PMI requirement for Rel-17 feType II port selection, for FDD FR1.  Test setup:  Observation 3: Standardization of a test procedure for feType II PS performance requirements is a complex problem, in particular if the SS/BS algorithm for UL/DL reciprocity based beam selection is to be modelled.  Proposal 2: Include feType II PS performance requirements utilizing CSI-RS transmission with a predetermined beam selection used in the transmission.  Observation 4: TE complexity reduction and UL/DL reciprocity modelling can be achieved with known test setups.  Observation 5: An important use case for the feType II PMI is to enhance MU-MIMO throughput by providing a much more accurate representation of the strongest channel eigenvectors than Type I single panel PMI. This allows the Gnb to steer the beams of co-scheduled Ues in each other’s null space with less residual interference.  Observation 6: SU-MIMO throughput is less sensitive than MU-MIMO to PMI inaccuracies because MU-MIMO throughput is limited by interference between co-scheduled Ues.  Observation 7: A DUT could in practice be able to report a feType II PMI that does not represent well the main eigenvectors of the channel and still pass an SU-MIMO test for feType II, because the throughput difference between Type I SP and feType II is not large enough for SU-MIMO transmission.  Proposal 3: RAN4 to evaluate both SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO options for the propagation environment and/or interference setting, when determining the Rel-17 feType II PS performance requirements. |
| R4-2205426 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: Consider defining PMI requirement for Rel-17 eType II port selection only if RAN4 can reach an agreement on a simplified way of testing with SU-MIMO test set-up, otherwise not to define requiremen***t.*** |
| R4-2205777 | Huawei | Proposal 1: Define PMI reporting requirement for Rel-17 FeTypeII port selection codebook based on evaluation on the performance gain over eTypeII codebook.  Proposal 2: Only consider SU-MIMO setup if PMI reporting requirement for FeTypeII port selection is introduced.  Proposal 3: Further discuss the odelling method if PMI reporting requirement for FeTypeII port selection is introduced. |

## Open issues summary

Last RAN4 meeting agreeements in the WF R4-2203090/91/92

List of open issues

* Sub-topic 4-1 Test Scope
  + Issue 4-1-1: Whether to define PMI requirement for Rel-17 FeTye II PS codebook
* Sub-topic 4-2: Test setup of PMI reporting requirement for FeType II PS codebook if introduced
  + Issue 4-2-1: General Test seup of PMI reporting requirement
  + Issue 4-2-2: Modelling BF CSI-RS Port

### Sub-topic 4-1: Test Scope

**Issue 4-1-1: Whether to define PMI requirement for Rel-17 FeTye II PS codebook**

* Observations
  + Observation1(Nokia):
    - The Rel-17 feTypeIIPS codebook is (for the UE) a lower complexity version of Rel-16 eTypeIIPS style of codebooks, which can be equally well applied to both MU and SU MIMO scenarios.
    - The Rel-17 further enhanced type II port selection codebook is structurally, computationally, and implementation wise, very distinct from the Rel-16 PS codebook and requirements do not exist for any codebooks with comparable structure.
* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung, Nokia, Huawei): Yes
    - Option 1a(Huawei): Define PMI reporting requirement for Rel-17 FeTypeII port selection codebook based on evaluation on the performance gain over eTypeII codebook.
    - Option 1b(Ericsson): Consider defining PMI requirement for Rel-17 eType II port selection only if RAN4 can reach an agreement on a simplified way of testing with SU-MIMO test set-up, otherwise not to define requirement**.**
  + Option 2 (Samsung, Nokia, Huawei): No
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any
  + Encourage companies to check whether it is acceptable to define PMI reporting requirement for Rel-17 FeTypeII port selection codebook based on majority view?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We still support option 2. Both gNB and UE requirements need to be verified for eType II port selection if requirements are introduced, not only UE but also gNB requirements should be introduced. |
| Qualcomm | We are of the opinion that the requirement for FeTypeII PS CB should not be defined in Rel-17. The gNB BF implementation is not standardized for FeTypeII PS CB, for which UE performance cannot be guaranteed. Even with the example in relation to LTE Rel-13 FD MIMO that came up during the first round of discussion, any restriction on the gNB BF does not guarantee optimal performance for UE. Therefore, it becomes more to a functional test. Furthermore, absence of a baseline performance from earlier releases, we don’t support introducing requirement for FeTypeII PS CB. |
| Ericsson | We suggest to keep it open. In our view, whether to have such requirement depends on the test setup discussion, especially for the gNB implementation model and test metric(how to compare the performance and how to observe the enhancement benefit). We prefer to discuss together with test setup and test metric. |
| Huawei | Further evaluation is needed to decide whether to define requirements based on the performance gains. |
| Nokia | We prefer option 1b to have PMI as baseline pending acceptance from the Test Equipment vendors for test set-up.  Compromise proposal: keep the options open until next meeting so proponents of option 1 can bring more details on how a gNB implementation independent test set-up can be achieved |

### Sub-topic 4-2: Test setup of PMI reporting requirement for FeType II PS codebook if introduced

**Issue 4-2-1: General Test seup of PMI reporting requirement**

* Observations
  + Observation 1 (Nokia):
    - Option 1b(Ericsson): Consider defining PMI requirement for Rel-17 eType II port selection only if RAN4 can reach an agreement on a simplified way of testing with SU-MIMO test set-up, otherwise not to define requirement**.** Standardization of a test procedure for feType II PS performance requirements is a complex problem, in particular if the SS/BS algorithm for UL/DL reciprocity based beam selection is to be modelled.
    - TE complexity reduction and UL/DL reciprocity modelling can be achieved with known test setups.
    - An important use case for the feType II PMI is to enhance MU-MIMO throughput by providing a much more accurate representation of the strongest channel eigenvectors than Type I single panel PMI. This allows the Gnb to steer the beams of co-scheduled Ues in each other’s null space with less residual interference.
    - SU-MIMO throughput is less sensitive than MU-MIMO to PMI inaccuracies because MU-MIMO throughput is limited by interference between co-scheduled Ues.
    - A DUT could in practice be able to report a feType II PMI that does not represent well the main eigenvectors of the channel and still pass an SU-MIMO test for feType II, because the throughput difference between Type I SP and feType II is not large enough for SU-MIMO transmission.
* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Nokia): Both SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO
  + Option 2 (Samsung, Huawei, Ericsson): SU-MIMO
* Recommended WF
  + Option 2

**Issue 4-2-2: Modelling BF CSI-RS Port**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung)
    - Option 1a: MIMO fading channel as Rel-13 LTE Class B K=1 PMI test cases
    - Option 1b: Power scaling method similar as Rel-13 LTE Class B K>1 CRI test case
  + Option 2(Huawei)
    - Further discuss the modeling method if PMI reporting requirement for FeTypeII port selection is introduced.
  + Option 3(Nokia)
    - Include feType II PS performance requirements utilizing CSI-RS transmission with a predetermined beam selection used in the transmission.
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*One of the two formats, i.e. either example 1 or 2 can be used by moderators.*

Sub topic 4-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 4-1-1 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 4-1-1  Nokia agree with the WF. We would like to agree with option 1b to have PMI as baseline pending acceptance from the Test Equipment vendors for test set-up. |
| Intel | Support to define PMI requirement for Rel-17 FeTye II PS codebook. |
| Apple | We don’t support introducing requirements for FeType II port selection. No requirements for PS have been introduced since Rel-15 because of the complexity to test it. Its not only UE, but also the Gnb that needs to have the right processing for PS. How is the Gnb processing proposed to be tested? |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 4-1-1: Whether to define PMI requirement for Rel-17 FeTye II PS codebook**  Our understanding is that FeTypeII PS CB would require implementation of the CB at the Gnb side (based on the estimated delay/angle from UL reference signal), which is not standardized. Furthermore, requirements were not defined in earlier releases for PS CB, therefore no baseline performance is available. Considering the above limitations, we are not in favor of introducing requirement for FeTypeII PS CB. |
| Ericsson | Issue 4-1-1:  We prefer to discuss the possible test procedure and test metric first and then come back to whether to define such requirement  Regarding to the test metric, if we simply compare the performance with Type I random, then how can we tell the enhancement is really from eType II PS CB? We lack baseline performance for comparison. |
| Huawei | **Issue 4-1-1: Whether to define PMI requirement for Rel-17 FeType II PS codebook**  We are OK to define PMI reporting requirement for Rel-17 FeTypeII port selection codebook if there is performance gain over Rel-16 eTypeII codebook. Further evaluation is needed until the next meeting. |
| Samsung | Issue 4-1-1  We support option 1  The Rel-17 enhanced Type II PS codebook was introduced to utilize partial channel information from DL/UL reciprocity in FDD system by uplink signal i.e. SRS, DMRS and others can be obtained from UE reporting to have hybrid beamforming BS side for DL transmission.  To Apple, and QC  It’s true the final beamforming generation belongs to BS implementation. Similar as LTE Rel-13 FD-MIMO, Class B PMI reporting with BF CSI-RS resource, the test purpose was to verify UE following codebook configuration to report proper codebook, with any restriction in Gnb side for beamforming.  To Ericsson  Regarding the test procedure, we can further discuss. In LTE Rel-13, we have BF CSI-RS resource for CSI class B k> 1 CRI test and K=1 port selection selection test cases already introduced in Rel-13 LTE FD-MIMO WI  In LTE, power scaling method adopted to model beamforming CSI-RS resource given from UE receiver side, BS beamforming is transparent to UE with equivalent SNR difference. And for Rel-13 class B K=1 test case, MIMO fading channel was used for port selection CB.  We can use it as starting point,  Regarding the test metric, in our understanding, at least random type II Post selection with the BF CSI-RS can be considered for requirement |

Sub topic 4-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 4-2-1  Issue 4-2-2 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 4-2-1  Agree on SU-MIMO and FFS for MU-MIMO  Issue 4-2-2  We are currently further evaluating the options suggested by Samsung. |
| Ericsson | Issue 4-2-1:  Support option 2 if it is introduced.  Issue 4-2-2:  Need further check. |
| Huawei | **Issue 4-2-1: General Test setup of PMI reporting requirement**  Support the recommended WF.  **Issue 4-2-2: Modelling BF CSI-RS Port**  We are open to find a feasible method for the PS codebook PMI testing. Further evaluation is needed until next meeting. |
| Samsung | Issue 4-2-1  Ok with recommended WF.  Regarding test set-up with SU-MIMO vs. MU-MIMO, we would like highlight this codebook introduced for above specific scenario which not relevant to MU-MIMO scenario optimization which different compared to Rel-15/16 Type II codebook even they follow same codebook structure.  Issue 4-2-2  We can use option 1 at start point |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize Wis and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing Wis, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic 4-1** | **Issue 4-1-1: Whether to define PMI requirement for Rel-17 FeTye II PS codebook**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung, Nokia, Huawei, Intel): Yes     - Option 1a(Huawei): Define PMI reporting requirement for Rel-17 FeTypeII port selection codebook based on evaluation on the performance gain over eTypeII codebook.     - Option 1b(Ericsson): Consider defining PMI requirement for Rel-17 eType II port selection only if RAN4 can reach an agreement on a simplified way of testing with SU-MIMO test set-up, otherwise not to define requirement**.**   + Option 2 (Apple, Qualcomm): No   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Encourage comments if any |
| **Sub-topic**  **4-2** | **Issue 4-2-1: General Test seup of PMI reporting requirement**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Nokia): Both SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO   + Option 2 (Samsung, Huawei, Ericsson): SU-MIMO   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * SU-MIMO, FFS on MU-MIMO   **Issue 4-2-2: Modelling BF CSI-RS Port**  *Candidate options*   * Proposals   + Option 1 (Samsung)     - Option 1a: MIMO fading channel as Rel-13 LTE Class B K=1 PMI test cases     - Option 1b: Power scaling method similar as Rel-13 LTE Class B K>1 CRI test case   + Option 2(Huawei)     - Further discuss the modeling method if PMI reporting requirement for FeTypeII port selection is introduced.   + Option 3(Nokia)     - Include feType II PS performance requirements utilizing CSI-RS transmission with a predetermined beam selection used in the transmission.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Apply option 1 as starting point for initial evaluation |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

**Issue 3-2-4: Number of CSI-RS Ports**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Qualcomm):
    - 8 for each TRP
  + Option 2 (Samsung, Apple, Huawei, Nokia, MTK, Qualcomm):
    - 4 for each TRP
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are encouraged to provide the simulation result in the next meeting with both option 1 and option 2 base on agreed simulation assumption to check the performance gain with the test metric, i.e. throughput ratio with a given SNR test. Make the decision about number of CSI-RS ports in next meeting.



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 2 is acceptable. |
| Qualcomm | We think it could be difficult to define requirement with 4-port CSI-RS since the precoding gain could be minimal. However, we are okay to compromise on this and support Option 2 as a starting point, but would like to keep it open pending simulation results. |
| Ericsson | We support to decide it in the next meeting based on the simulation results, e.g. throughput ratio with a given SNR test point. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the Option 2. However, we are fine to postpone final decision until simulation results are available. |
| Huawei | We prefer Option 2. |
| Nokia | We support option 2 as a starting point. |

**Issue 3-2-7: Performance evaluation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Apple): Evaluate performance of PMI reporting with enhanced CSI reporting against single PMI reporting for multi-TRP transmission.
  + Option 2 (Huawei, Samsung): there is no necessary to do evaluations to find the gain for the enhanced CSI reporting comparing to the single-TRP hypothesis for multi-TRP scenario.
* Recommended WF
  + Interested companies can provide the performance evaluation of PMI reporting with enhanced CSI reporting against single PMI reporting for multi-TRP transmission. No impact on the PMI reporting requirement definition for single-DCI based Multi-TRP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We support the recommended WF. |
| Ericsson | Support the recommended WF. |
| Mediatek | We support the recommended WF. |
| Huawei | OK with the recommended WF. |

**Issue 3-2-8: Codebook Structure**

Candidate options:

* Option 1: Reusing the existing Rel-15 PMI requirement setup: i.e, type I single panel

Recommended WF

* Option 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Okay with the recommended WF |
| Ericsson | Support the recommended WF. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the recommended WF. |
| Huawei | OK with the recommended WF. |

**Issue 4-1-1: Whether to define PMI requirement for Rel-17 FeTye II PS codebook**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung, Nokia, Huawei, Intel): Yes
    - Option 1a(Huawei): Define PMI reporting requirement for Rel-17 FeTypeII port selection codebook based on evaluation on the performance gain over eTypeII codebook.
    - Option 1b(Ericsson): Consider defining PMI requirement for Rel-17 eType II port selection only if RAN4 can reach an agreement on a simplified way of testing with SU-MIMO test set-up, otherwise not to define requirement**.**
  + Option 2 (Apple, Qualcomm): No
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We still support option 2. Both gNB and UE requirements need to be verified for eType II port selection if requirements are introduced, not only UE but also gNB requirements should be introduced. |
| Qualcomm | We are of the opinion that the requirement for FeTypeII PS CB should not be defined in Rel-17. The gNB BF implementation is not standardized for FeTypeII PS CB, for which UE performance cannot be guaranteed. Even with the example in relation to LTE Rel-13 FD MIMO that came up during the first round of discussion, any restriction on the gNB BF does not guarantee optimal performance for UE. Therefore, it becomes more to a functional test. Furthermore, absence of a baseline performance from earlier releases, we don’t support introducing requirement for FeTypeII PS CB. |
| Ericsson | We suggest to keep it open. In our view, whether to have such requirement depends on the test setup discussion, especially for the gNB implementation model and test metric(how to compare the performance and how to observe the enhancement benefit). We prefer to discuss together with test setup and test metric. |
| Huawei | Further evaluation is needed to decide whether to define requirements based on the performance gains. |
| Nokia | We prefer option 1b to have PMI as baseline pending acceptance from the Test Equipment vendors for test set-up.  Compromise proposal: keep the options open until next meeting so proponents of option 1 can bring more details on how a gNB implementation independent test set-up can be achieved |

**Issue 4-2-1: General Test seup of PMI reporting requirement**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Nokia): Both SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO
  + Option 2 (Samsung, Huawei, Ericsson): SU-MIMO
* Recommended WF
  + SU-MIMO is acceptable?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Ericsson | SU-MIMO if the requirement is introduced. |
| Huawei | OK with the recommended WF. |
| Nokia | The Rel-16 Port Selection codebook was mainly intended for MU-MIMO.  The Rel-17 Port Selection codebook was intended for both SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO.  Therefore, it is unfortunate if we cannot agree on testing both if the PMI requirement for Rel-17 Enhanced Type II Port Selection codebook is introduced |

**Issue 4-2-2: Modelling BF CSI-RS Port**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (Samsung)
    - Option 1a: MIMO fading channel as Rel-13 LTE Class B K=1 PMI test cases
    - Option 1b: Power scaling method similar as Rel-13 LTE Class B K>1 CRI test case
  + Option 2(Huawei)
    - Further discuss the modeling method if PMI reporting requirement for FeTypeII port selection is introduced.
  + Option 3(Nokia)
    - Include feType II PS performance requirements utilizing CSI-RS transmission with a predetermined beam selection used in the transmission.
* Recommended WF
  + Apply option 1 as starting point for initial evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Ericsson | SU-MIMO if the requirement is introduced. |
| Huawei | OK with the recommended WF. |
| Nokia | The Rel-16 Port Selection codebook was mainly intended for MU-MIMO.  The Rel-17 Port Selection codebook was intended for both SU-MIMO and MU-MIMO.  Therefore, it is unfortunate if we cannot agree on testing both if the PMI requirement for Rel-17 Enhanced Type II Port Selection codebook is introduced |

# Topic #5: Other

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2203779 | Apple | **PMI reporting in ICI**  Proposal 7: RAN4 further evaluates PMI reporting in ICI before deciding to introduce requirements.  Proposal 8: For further evaluation of PMI reporting in ICI use the following simulation assumptions:   * Antenna config: 8x2 XP High * Prop. channel model: TDLA30-5; ensure that channel from target and interference cell are statistically independent and have different beam direction (to ensure PMI are different) * NZP CSI-RS for interference:   + Overlapping with serving cell   + Non-overlapping with serving cell * CSI-IM for interference: non overlapping with CSI-IM for serving cell * Loading for interference cell: PDSCH transmission is enabled in all slots for interference cell   Proposal 9: Evaluate performance based on TP ratio with and with ICI for (1) overlapping NZP CSI-RS (2) non-overlapping NZP CSI-RS.  Proposal 10: The scope of PMI reporting in ICI is approved in FeMIMO WID or part TEI-17 for further discussion in RAN4. |
| R4-2204784 | Samsung | Observation 1: PMI reporting with inter-cell colliding NZP CSI-RS interference belongs to generic network scheduling issues, not related to the objectives/features in FeMIMO WI and which is out of Rel-17 FeMIMO WI scope.  Proposal 6: NO discussion/handling of the topic for PMI reporting under inter-cell interference in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI.   * This issue can be handled under either TEI-17 or Rel-18 specific WI pending on the consensus in RAN4. |
| R4-2205425 | Ericsson | Observation 1: When interfering cell is strong at the cell edge, the corresponding spatial covariance matrix of the interference term of the channel estimate, , does not only deviate from being spatially white, but it also equals to the spatial covariance of the interfering cell.  Observation 2: Due to the current NR CSI-RS design, where CSI-RS sequences of different ports are not randomized but same for multiple ports, leads to that is very far from spatially white which causes false PMI selection.  Observation 3: Network deployments where cell planning is used for CSI-RS can only partially mitigate the problem in the general case, due to strongly interfering stray signals transmitted from cells further away which are commonly observed in e.g., metropolitan deployments.  Observation 4: Network deployment with colliding CSI-RS between all cells have significant benefits to the operator in terms of no need for such network planning, ease of network densification and evolution when adding new sites, lower reference signal overhead and low interference at low load in network. Deploying with non-colliding RS should be avoided due to these reasons.  Proposal 1: RAN4 to first evaluate the impact brought by false PMI reporting solution, then discuss a proper model to reveal this issue, and consider introducing the corresponding PMI reporting requirement to resolve this issue.  Observation 5: Colliding CSI-RS with 3GPP sequence(original) has the worst performance across the whole SNR range. The throughput loss is more than 10%.  Observation 6: Non-colliding or new sequence for CSI-RS improves performance but has other drawbacks as discussed in this contribution  Observation 7: There is an obviously performance degradation when false PMI reporting configured using the ‘wrong W1 model’. |
| R4-2205778 | Huawei | Proposal 1: Firstly focus on the RAN1 feature for FeMIMO demodulation requirements definition considering the limitation TU for RAN4 FeMIMO performance part. |
| R4-2205908 | MTK | Observation 1: There is throughput degradation when UE report wrong PMI under the scenario of inter-cell interference.  Proposal 1: Define PMI requirements for the scenario of inter-cell interference.  Proposal 2: The test metric can be throughput ratio between follow PMI with inter-cell interference and follow PMI without interference. |

## Open issues summary

Last RAN4 meeting agreeements in the WF R4-2203090/91/92

List of open issues

* Sub-topic 5-1 PMI reporting requirement with inter-cell interference
  + Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO
  + Issue 5-1-2: PMI reporting with inter-cell interference evaluation assumption
  + Issue 5-1-3: Test metric of PMI reporting with inter-cell interference

### Sub-topic 5-1: PMI reporting requirement with inter-cell interference

**Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**

* Observations
  + Observation 1 (Samsung): PMI reporting with inter-cell colliding NZP CSI-RS interference belongs to generic network scheduling issues, not related to the objectives/features in FeMIMO WI and which is out of Rel-17 FeMIMO WI scope.
  + Observation 2 (Ericsson):
    - Observation 1: When interfering cell is strong at the cell edge, the corresponding spatial covariance matrix of the interference term of the channel estimate, , does not only deviate from being spatially white, but it also equals to the spatial covariance of the interfering cell.
    - Observation 2: Due to the current NR CSI-RS design, where CSI-RS sequences of different ports are not randomized but same for multiple ports, leads to that is very far from spatially white which causes false PMI selection.
    - Observation 3: Network deployments where cell planning is used for CSI-RS can only partially mitigate the problem in the general case, due to strongly interfering stray signals transmitted from cells further away which are commonly observed in e.g., metropolitan deployments.
    - Observation 4: Network deployment with colliding CSI-RS between all cells have significant benefits to the operator in terms of no need for such network planning, ease of network densification and evolution when adding new sites, lower reference signal overhead and low interference at low load in network. Deploying with non-colliding RS should be avoided due to these reasons.
    - Observation 5: Colliding CSI-RS with 3GPP sequence (original) has the worst performance across the whole SNR range. The throughput loss is more than 10%.
    - Observation 6: Non-colliding or new sequence for CSI-RS improves performance but has other drawbacks as discussed in this contribution
    - Observation 7: There is an obviously performance degradation when false PMI reporting configured using the ‘wrong W1 model’.
  + Observation 3(MTK):
    - There is throughput degradation when UE report wrong PMI under the scenario of inter-cell interference.
* Proposals
  + Option 1(Huawei, Samsung): No
    - Option 1a (Huawei): Firstly focus on the RAN1 feature for FeMIMO demodulation requirements definition considering the limitation TU for RAN4 FeMIMO performance part.
    - Option 1b (Samsung): NO discussion/handling of the topic for PMI reporting under inter-cell interference in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI
* This issue can be handled under either TEI-17 or Rel-18 specific WI pending on the consensus in RAN4
  + Option 2(Ericsson): RAN4 to first evaluate the impact brought by false PMI reporting solution, then discuss a proper model to reveal this issue, and consider introducing the corresponding PMI reporting requirement to resolve this issue
  + Option 3 (MTK, Ericsson): RAN4 defines PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario
  + Option 4(Apple):
    - RAN4 further evaluates PMI reporting in ICI before deciding to introduce requirements.
    - The scope of PMI reporting in ICI is approved in FeMIMO WID or part TEI-17 for further discussion in RAN4.
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments if any
  + Based on WID of Rel-17 FeMIMO WI, PMI reporting with inter-cell interference is out of FeMIMO WI scope. Following WID, moderator suggest to not define PMI reporting requirement with inter-cell interference in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI. Encourage companies to check whether it is acceptable?
  + FFS on discussion and handling of PMI reporting requirement with inter-cell interference under either TEI-17 or Rel-18 specific WI pending on the consensus of RAN4 group

**Issue 5-1-2: PMI reporting with inter-cell interference evaluation assumption**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Apple): For further evaluation of PMI reporting in ICI use the following simulation assumptions:
    - Antenna config: 8x2 XP High
    - Prop. channel model: TDLA30-5; ensure that channel from target and interference cell are statistically independent and have different beam direction (to ensure PMI are different)
    - NZP CSI-RS for interference:
* Overlapping with serving cell
* Non-overlapping with serving cell
  + - CSI-IM for interference: non overlapping with CSI-IM for serving cell
    - Loading for interference cell: PDSCH transmission is enabled in all slots for interference cell
    - Evaluate performance based on TP ratio with and with ICI for (1) overlapping NZP CSI-RS (2) non-overlapping NZP CSI-RS
* Recommended WF
  + Pending on issue 5-1-1

**Issue 5-1-3: Test metric of PMI reporting with inter-cell interference**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(MTK)
    - TP ratio with following PMI with inter-cell interference and follow PMI without interference
* Recommended WF
  + Pending on issue 5-1-1

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*One of the two formats, i.e. either example 1 or 2 can be used by moderators.*

Sub topic 5-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 5-1-1  Issue 5-1-2  Issue 5-1-3 |
| Apple | **Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**  We agree with the moderator’s observation. We raised the same issue in last meeting discussion and this meeting that this is not part of FeMIMO enh. We are fine to evaluate if there is agreement to include this as part of FeMIMO WID or as part of TEI if suitable.  Other issues can be decided pending where this issue can be discussed. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**  Given that it may require further evaluation and limited WI time budget, we are in agreement with moderator’s suggestion not to define requirement in inter-cell scenario. Since this will require further evaluation, we are also not sure whether this could be included in TEI, however, we are open to discuss this during Rel-18 timeframe. If possible, we could also request RAN1 to consider re-designing CSI-RS sequences across ports, e.g., randomized with different scrambling sequences. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**  We support option 2 and 3. Like many companies suggested in RAN1 discussion, we also found there is a need to address this issue in RAN4, especially when the proposal of revising the CSI-RS sequence was not approved. We found it might be necessary to consider defining such performance requirement to guarantee the performance.  Detailed description and the root cause of this issue can be found in our contribution R4-2205425.  To be simple, when interfering cell is strong at the cell edge, the corresponding spatial covariance matrix of the interference term of the channel estimate, Ree, does not only deviate from being spatially white, but it also equals to the spatial covariance of the interfering cell. So, actually the UE is reporting the wrong PMI to its serving cell.  In our model for initial evaluation, we assume a wrong W1 selection to reflect the wrong PMI reporting from UE. Usually, we calculate the W1 by finding the max wideband power for each antenna. Here, we can use another W1 which does not max the wideband power, this is the wrong W1.  From our initial evaluation, we observed average 2dB performance loss with the model above and colliding CSI-RS configured.  Non-colliding CSI-RS by network planning can solve some of the issue, especially in a perfectly hexagonal site layout. But in reality, there could be street canyon effects, hilly terrain etc where a cell far away strongly interferes in some spots of a serving cell. Besides, non-colliding CSI-RS also has many drawbacks including:   * It requires frequency planning and re-planning of RS resources * It generatesinterference from adjacent cells to PDSCH, even if the adjacent cell has no ongoing traffic * It may generate significant RS overhead due to the use of ZP CSI-RS for protection of PDSCH   Therefore, to consider another way out instead of non-colliding CSI-RS scheduling, we encourage companies to further check and consider the need of such requirement.  **Issue 5-1-2: PMI reporting with inter-cell interference evaluation assumption**  We are fine with option 1 for initial evaluation.  **Issue 5-1-3: Test metric of PMI reporting with inter-cell interference**  We are fine with option 1 for initial evaluation. |
| Mediatek | **Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**  We prefer to define PMI requirements and we are fine to discuss whether it can be included in the TEI-17. |
| Huawei | **Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**  We are OK with the recommended WF. We should firstly focus on the RAN1 feature for FeMIMO demodulation requirements definition considering the limited TU for RAN4 FeMIMO performance part. Considering that this issue is out of scope of FeMIMO WI, it is more feasible to discuss this issue in Rel-18. Maybe new CSI-RS sequence generation solution can be proposed in RAN1 Rel-18 discussion to handle this issue at the root. |
| Verizon | **Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**  We support option 2 and 3. And, we don’t agree the moderator’s suggestion for not to define requirement in inter-cell scenario.  It is observed there is throughput degradation when UE report wrong PMI under the scenario of inter-cell interference and RAN4 needs to define PMI requirements.  **Issue 5-1-2: PMI reporting with inter-cell interference evaluation assumption**  We are fine with option 1 for initial evaluation.  **Issue 5-1-3: Test metric of PMI reporting with inter-cell interference**  We are fine with option 1 for initial evaluation. |
| AT&T | **Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**  We support option 2 or 3.  **Issue 5-1-2: PMI reporting with inter-cell interference evaluation assumption**  OK with option 1 for initial evaluation.  **Issue 5-1-3: Test metric of PMI reporting with inter-cell interference**  OK with option 1 for initial evaluation. |
| Samsung | We agree the recommended WF  In general, we can understand in real field we may face performance degradation issue with PMI estimation mismatch during the colliding neighboring cell CSI-RS interference  While we would like like to highlight this issue not relevant to any specific enhanced features/objectives specified under Rel-17 FeMIMO even companies submitted contributions and open the discussion under FeMIMO WI in last RAN4 meeting.  We are open to further discuss and address this issue if we found critical issues under real filed but we shall respect normal RAN4 procedure to handle topics following the WID with proper scope. And we shouldn’t hide the discussion under FeMIMO WI.  Considering the schedule and many open issues in Rel-17 FeMMO, we suggest to focus on the requirement definition based on RAN1 feature of FeMIMO. So, we prefer to no PMI requirement with inter-cell interference in Rel-17 FeMIMO. This issue can be further discussed in Rel-17 TEI or Rel-18 specific WI pending on the consensus in RAN4  Meanwhile, this issue is coming from real field, based on Rel-15/16 UE. For Rel-17 FeMIMO, there is no related UE in the market |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic #1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic 5-1** | **Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Huawei, Samsung, Qualcomm ): No     - Option 1a (Huawei): Firstly focus on the RAN1 feature for FeMIMO demodulation requirements definition considering the limitation TU for RAN4 FeMIMO performance part.     - Option 1b (Samsung): NO discussion/handling of the topic for PMI reporting under inter-cell interference in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI * This issue can be handled under either TEI-17 or Rel-18 specific WI pending on the consensus in RAN4   + Option 2(Ericsson, Verizon, AT&T): RAN4 to first evaluate the impact brought by false PMI reporting solution, then discuss a proper model to reveal this issue, and consider introducing the corresponding PMI reporting requirement to resolve this issue   + Option 3 (MTK, Ericsson, Verizon, AT&T ): RAN4 defines PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario   + Option 4(Apple):     - RAN4 further evaluates PMI reporting in ICI before deciding to introduce requirements.     - The scope of PMI reporting in ICI is approved in FeMIMO WID or part TEI-17 for further discussion in RAN4.   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Encourage comments if any * Based on WID of Rel-17 FeMIMO WI, PMI reporting with inter-cell interference is out of FeMIMO WI scope. Following WID, moderator suggest to not define PMI reporting requirement with inter-cell interference in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI. Encourage companies to check whether it is acceptable? * FFS on discussion and handling of PMI reporting requirement with inter-cell interference under either TEI-17 or Rel-18 specific WI pending on the consensus of RAN4 group   + Option 1 (Apple, Samsung, MTK): Rel-17 TEI   + Option 2 (Qualcomm, Huawei, Samsung): Rel-18 timeframe   **Issue 5-1-2: PMI reporting with inter-cell interference evaluation assumption**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(Apple, Ericsson, Verizon, AT&T): For further evaluation of PMI reporting in ICI use the following simulation assumptions:     - Antenna config: 8x2 XP High     - Prop. channel model: TDLA30-5; ensure that channel from target and interference cell are statistically independent and have different beam direction (to ensure PMI are different)     - NZP CSI-RS for interference: * Overlapping with serving cell * Non-overlapping with serving cell   + - CSI-IM for interference: non overlapping with CSI-IM for serving cell     - Loading for interference cell: PDSCH transmission is enabled in all slots for interference cell     - Evaluate performance based on TP ratio with and with ICI for (1) overlapping NZP CSI-RS (2) non-overlapping NZP CSI-RS   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Pending on Issue 5-1-1   **Issue 5-1-3: Test metric of PMI reporting with inter-cell interference**  *Candidate options:*   * Proposals   + Option 1(MTK, Ericsson, Verizon, AT&T)     - TP ratio with following PMI with inter-cell interference and follow PMI without interference   *Recommendations for 2nd round:*   * Pending on Issue 5-1-1 |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

**Issue 5-1-1: whether to define PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario in Rel-17 FeMIMO**

* Proposals
  + Option 1(Huawei, Samsung, Qualcomm ): No
    - Option 1a (Huawei): Firstly focus on the RAN1 feature for FeMIMO demodulation requirements definition considering the limitation TU for RAN4 FeMIMO performance part.
    - Option 1b (Samsung): NO discussion/handling of the topic for PMI reporting under inter-cell interference in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI
* This issue can be handled under either TEI-17 or Rel-18 specific WI pending on the consensus in RAN4
  + Option 2(Ericsson, Verizon, AT&T): RAN4 to first evaluate the impact brought by false PMI reporting solution, then discuss a proper model to reveal this issue, and consider introducing the corresponding PMI reporting requirement to resolve this issue
  + Option 3 (MTK, Ericsson, Verizon, AT&T ): RAN4 defines PMI reporting requirement for inter-cell interference scenario
  + Option 4(Apple):
    - RAN4 further evaluates PMI reporting in ICI before deciding to introduce requirements.
    - The scope of PMI reporting in ICI is approved in FeMIMO WID or part TEI-17 for further discussion in RAN4.
* Recommended WF
  + FFS on PMI reporting requirement with inter-cell interference in Rel-17 FeMIMO WI
  + FFS on where to handle the PMI reporting requirement with inter-cell interference
    - Option 1 (Apple, Samsung, MTK, Ericsson, AT&T, Intel): Rel-17 TEI
    - Option 2 (Qualcomm, Huawei, Samsung): Rel-18 timeframe
    - Option 3 (Ericsson, AT&T, MTK, Intel): Rel-17 FeMIMO WI

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We proposed that - o The scope of PMI reporting in ICI is approved in FeMIMO WID or part TEI-17 for further discussion in RAN4.  Support option 1 from Moderator’s options. |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 2. Since it requires further evaluation, Rel-17 TEI may not be feasible. |
| Ericsson | We are also fine with option 1 if it is feasible.  But we are afraid that introducing PMI reporting requirement with ICI is too big to be considered in the TEI, since it requires several meetings to discuss, evaluate and define corresponding requirements. In this case, we also propose to add the PMI reporting with ICI into the WID of Rel-17 FeMIMO WI to handle the discussion of defining requirement. |
| AT&T | We are also OK with option 1 if the level of effort can be managed. We would be concerned if the Rel-17 TEI effort turned out to be similar to the TXD situation. We would also support option 3 as described by Ericsson. |
| Mediatek | We support Option 1. We are also fine with Option 3. |
| Intel | We support Option 1 and 3. |
| Huawei | We prefer Option 2. |
| Samsung | In general, we are open to address this issue. This issue is coming from real field test, based on Rel-15/16 feature. In general, it can be handled with network scheduling.  Based on current WID of Rel-17 FeMIMO, it is out of scope. For FeMIMO WI, we should focus on the requirement definition base RAN1 feature, Considering limited time for this WI based on work plan, we donot think we need to further discuss and elevation for it with suffering many effort. Meanwhile, whether to update the WID is pending on RAN-P decision. This WI is led by RAN1, considering the core-requirement is completed, we don't think it is a proper way to add this issue into the WID at current stage, since we are not sure whether there is any RAN1 impact.  Therefore, we support to no requirement for PMI with inter-cell inference in Rel-17 FeMMO WI  Regarding how to handle this issue, we are fine either option 1 in TEI 17 or option 2 in Rel-18 time line As commented by companies, maybe Rel-18 time line is more proper if the consensus can be achieved by ran4 group and RAN-P meeting |

**Issue 5-1-2: PMI reporting with inter-cell interference evaluation assumption**

* Option 1(Apple, Ericsson, Verizon, AT&T): For further evaluation of PMI reporting in ICI use the following simulation assumptions as baseline
  + Antenna config: 8x2 XP High
  + Prop. Channel model: TDLA30-5; ensure that channel from target and interference cell are statistically independent and have different beam direction (to ensure PMI are different)
  + NZP CSI-RS for interference:
    - Overlapping with serving cell
    - Non-overlapping with serving cell
  + CSI-IM for interference: non overlapping with CSI-IM for serving cell
  + Loading for interference cell: PDSCH transmission is enabled in all slots for interference cell
  + Evaluate performance based on TP ratio with and with ICI for (1) overlapping NZP CSI-RS (2) non-overlapping NZP CSI-RS
* Other options are not precluded

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1 if agreed to be further evaluated. |
| AT&T | Option 1 should be used as the baseline for further evaluation. |
| Mediatek | We are OK with Option 1. |

**Issue 5-1-3: Test metric of PMI reporting with inter-cell interference**

Candidate options:

* Option 1(MTK, Ericsson, Verizon, AT&T)
  + TP ratio with following PMI with inter-cell interference and follow PMI without interference
* Other options are not precluded

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Pending further evaluation and on whether new requirements are introduced |
| AT&T | Option 1 should be used as the baseline for the new test metric. |
| Mediatek | We support Option 1 and do not preclude other test metrics which can be used to verify the correct behavior of UE. |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on demodulation requirement for Enhancement on Multi-TRP | Huawei, HiSilicon | Topic 1 |
| WF on demodulation requirement for Enhancement on HST-SFN deployment | Intel | Topic 2 |
| WF on CSI requirement for Rel-17 FeMIMO | Samsung | Topic 3, 4 and 5 |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-2207207 | WF on demodulation requirement for Enhancement on Multi-TRP | Huawei, HiSilicon | Revised, |  |
| R4-2207208 | WF on demodulation requirement for Enhancement on HST-SFN deployment | Intel | Revised |  |
| R4-2207209 | WF on CSI requirement for Rel-17 FeMIMO | Samsung | Revised |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

# Annex

Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| Moderator (Samsung) | Yunchuan Yang | [yc0301.yang@samsung.com](mailto:yc0301.yang@samsung.com) |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Karsten Petersen | Karsten.petersen@nokia-bell-labs.com |
| Intel | Artyom Putilin | artyom.putilin@intel.com |
| Apple | Manasa Raghavan | Manasa.raghavan@apple.com |
| Qualcomm | Jahidur Rahman | rahman@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Mediatek | Hannu Vesala | hannu.vesala@mediatek.com |
| Huawei | Zehan Zhao | zhaozehan@hisilicon.com |
| AT&T | Ron Borsato | ronald.borsato@att.com |

Note:

1. Please add your contact information in above table once you make comments on this email thread.
2. If multiple delegates from the same company make comments on single email thread, please add you name as suffix after company name when make comments i.e. Company A (XX, XX)